

QUASIDERIVATIVE METHOD FOR DERIVATIVE ESTIMATES OF SOLUTIONS TO DEGENERATE ELLIPTIC EQUATIONS

WEI ZHOU

ABSTRACT. We introduce the concept of quasiderivative and give an example constructed by random time change, Girsanov's Theorem and Levy's Theorem. As an application, we investigate the smoothness and estimate the derivatives up to second order for probabilistic solutions to Dirichlet problems for linear degenerate elliptic partial differential equations of second order, under the assumption of non-degeneracy with respect to the normal to the boundary and an interior condition to control the moments of quasiderivatives, which is weaker than non-degeneracy. The probabilistic solution is the unique solution to the associated Dirichlet problem.

1. INTRODUCTION AND BACKGROUND

We consider the Dirichlet problem for the linear degenerate elliptic partial differential equation of second order

$$(1.1) \quad \begin{cases} Lu(x) - c(x)u(x) + f(x) &= 0 & \text{in } D \\ u &= g & \text{on } \partial D, \end{cases}$$

where $Lu(x) := a^{ij}(x)u_{x^i x^j}(x) + b^i(x)u_{x^i}(x)$, with $a = (1/2)\sigma\sigma^*$, and summation convention is understood. The probabilistic solution of (1.1) is known as

$$(1.2) \quad u(x) = E \left[g(x_\tau(x)) e^{-\phi_\tau} + \int_0^\tau f(x_t(x)) e^{-\phi_t} dt \right],$$

$$\text{with } \phi_t = \int_0^t c(x_s(x)) ds.$$

where $x_t(x)$ is the solution to the Itô equation

$$(1.3) \quad x_t = x + \int_0^t \sigma(x_s) dw_s + \int_0^t b(x_s) ds$$

and $\tau = \tau_D(x)$ is the first exit time of $x_t(x)$ from D .

If we know a priori that $u \in C^2(D) \cap C(\bar{D})$ and u solves (1.1), then u satisfies (1.2) via Itô's formula, which implies the uniqueness of the solution of (1.1) provided the uniqueness of the solution of (1.3). However, in general, u defined by (1.2) doesn't necessarily have first and second derivatives

in L , especially when a is degenerate, and the differential equation is understood in a generalized sense. We are interested in understanding under what conditions u defined by (1.2) is twice differentiable and does satisfy (1.1).

The accumulation of the research on existence, uniqueness and regularity of degenerate elliptic or parabolic partial differential equations has become vast. See, for example, Hörmander [2], Kohn-Nirenberg [3] and Oleinik-Radkevich [13], in which analysis techniques for PDEs are used. For probabilistic approaches, we refer to Freidlin [1] and Stroock-Varadhan [14], to name a few.

Our approach, quasiderivative method, is also probabilistic. The concept of quasiderivative was first introduced by N. V. Krylov in [6] (1988), in which this probabilistic technique is applied to find weaker and more flexible conditions on σ , b and c such that u in (1.2) is twice continuously differentiable in manifolds without boundary. Since then, this technique has been applied to investigate the interior smoothness of solutions of various elliptic and parabolic partial differential equations. The first derivatives of various linear elliptic and parabolic PDEs have been estimated under various conditions in Krylov [8] (1992), [9] (1993) and [11] (2004), where each case was treated by its particular choice of quasiderivatives. In Krylov [12] (2004), a unified method is presented, also based on quasiderivatives, while σ and b are assumed to be constant. As far as the applications to nonlinear equations, for example, in Krylov [7] (1989), derivative estimates are obtained when controlled diffusion processes and consequently fully nonlinear elliptic equations are considered.

Compared to the operators considered in [6, 8, 9, 11, 12], the differential equation in this article is more general. L in (1.1) is the general linear elliptic differential operator, and c and f are non-trivial. Also, we estimate the derivatives up to the second order, not just the first order. More precisely, our main target is investigating first derivatives of u if we only assume $f, g \in C^{0,1}(\bar{D})$, as well as the second derivatives therein when assuming $f, g \in C^{1,1}(\bar{D})$. Note that, in these cases, one cannot assert that the first and second derivatives of u are bounded up to the boundary (for example, see Remark 1.0.2 and Example 4.2.1 in [11]). One can only expect to prove that inside D the derivatives of u exist. We show that under our assumptions, the first and second derivatives of u in (1.2) exist almost everywhere in D , which implies the existence and uniqueness for degenerate boundary value problem (1.1) in our setting. We also obtain first and second derivative estimates.

This article is organized as follows: In Section 2, we review the concept of quasiderivative and give an example of it. In Section 3, we take this approach to show the existence of, and then estimate, the first and second derivatives of u in (1.2), under the assumption of the non-degeneracy of a with respect to the normal to the boundary and an interior condition to control the moments of quasiderivatives, which is weaker than the nondegeneracy of a .

To conclude this section, we introduce the notation: Above we have already defined $C^k(\bar{D})$, $k = 1$ or 2 , as the space of bounded continuous and k -times continuously differentiable functions in $\bar{D}$ with finite norm given by

$$|g|_{1,D} = |g|_{0,D} + |g_x|_{0,D}, \quad |g|_{2,D} = |g|_{1,D} + |g_{xx}|_{0,D},$$

respectively, where

$$|g|_{0,D} = \sup_{x \in D} |g(x)|,$$

g_x is the gradient vector of g , and g_{xx} is the Hessian matrix of g . For $\alpha \in (0, 1]$, the Hölder spaces $C^{k,\alpha}(\bar{D})$ are defined as the subspaces of $C^k(\bar{D})$ consisting of functions with finite norm

$$|g|_{k,\alpha,D} = |g|_{k,D} + [g]_{\alpha,D}, \quad \text{where } [g]_{\alpha,D} = \sup_{x,y \in D} \frac{|g(x) - g(y)|}{|x - y|^\alpha}.$$

$\mathbb{R}^d$ is the d -dimensional Euclidean space with $x = (x^1, x^2, \dots, x^d)$ representing a typical point in $\mathbb{R}^d$, and $(x, y) = \sum_{i=1}^d x^i y^i$ is the inner product for $x, y \in \mathbb{R}^d$. For $x, y, z \in \mathbb{R}^d$, set

$$u_{(y)} = \sum_{i=1}^d u_{x^i} y^i, \quad u_{(y)}(z) = \sum_{i,j=1}^d u_{x^i x^j} y^i z^j, \quad u_{(y)}^2 = (u_{(y)})^2.$$

For any matrix $\sigma = (\sigma^{ij})$,

$$\|\sigma\|^2 := \text{tr} \sigma \sigma^* = \sum_{i,j} (\sigma^{ij})^2.$$

For any $s, t \in \mathbb{R}$, we define

$$s \wedge t = \min(s, t), \quad s \vee t = \max(s, t).$$

Constants K, N and λ appearing in inequalities are usually not indexed. They may differ even in the same chain of inequalities.

2. DEFINITION AND EXAMPLES OF QUASIDERIVATIVE

In what follows, we consider the Itô stochastic equation

$$(2.1) \quad x_t = x + \int_0^t \sigma^i(x_s) dw_s^i + \int_0^t b(x_s) ds$$

on a given complete probability space $(\Omega, \mathcal{F}, P)$, where $x \in \mathbb{R}^d$, σ^i and b are (nonrandom) $\mathbb{R}^d$ -valued functions with bounded domain D in $\mathbb{R}^d$, defined for $i = 1, \dots, d_1$ with d_1 possibly different from d , and $w_t := (w_t^1, \dots, w_t^{d_1})$ is a d_1 -dimensional Wiener process with respect to a given increasing filtration $\{\mathcal{F}_t, t \geq 0\}$ of σ -algebras $\mathcal{F}_t \subset \mathcal{F}$, such that $\mathcal{F}_t$ contain all P -null sets. We denote by σ the $d \times d_1$ matrix composed of the column-vectors σ^i , $i = 1, \dots, d_1$. We also assume that σ and b are twice continuously differentiable in $\mathbb{R}^d$. Based on the assumptions above, for any $x \in D$, it is known that equation (2.1) has a unique solution $x_t(x)$ on $[0, \tau(x))$, where

$$\tau(x) = \inf\{t \geq 0 : x_t(x) \notin D\} \quad (\inf\{\emptyset\} := \infty).$$

Definition 2.1. We write

$$u \in \mathcal{M}^k(D, \sigma, b)$$

if u is a real-valued k times continuously differentiable function given on $\bar{D}$ such that the process $u(x_t(x))$ is a local $\{\mathcal{F}_t\}$ -martingale on $[0, \tau(x))$ for any $x \in D$.

We abbreviate $\mathcal{M}^k(D, \sigma, b)$ by $\mathcal{M}^k(D)$, or simply $\mathcal{M}^k$ when this will cause no confusion.

Definition 2.2. Let $x \in D$, and let τ be a stopping time, $\tau \leq \tau(x)$. Assume that $\xi \in \mathbb{R}^d$, ξ_t and ξ_t^0 are adapted continuous processes defined on $[0, \tau] \cap [0, \infty)$ with values in $\mathbb{R}^d$ and $\mathbb{R}$, respectively, such that $\xi_0 = \xi$.

We say that ξ_t is a **first quasiderivative** of $x_t(y)$ in the direction of ξ at point x on $[0, \tau)$ if for any $u \in \mathcal{M}^1(D, \sigma, b)$ the following process

$$(2.2) \quad u_{(\xi_t)}(x_t(x)) + \xi_t^0 u(x_t(x))$$

is a local martingale on $[0, \tau)$. In this case the process ξ_t^0 is called a **first adjoint process** for ξ_t . If $\tau = \tau(x)$ we simply say that ξ_t is a first quasiderivative of $x_t(y)$ in D in the direction of ξ at x .

Definition 2.3. Under the assumptions of Definition 2.2, additionally assume that $\eta \in \mathbb{R}^d$, η_t and η_t^0 are adapted continuous processes defined on $[0, \tau] \cap [0, \infty)$ with values in $\mathbb{R}^d$ and $\mathbb{R}$, respectively, such that $\eta_0 = \eta$.

We say that η_t is a **second quasiderivative** of $x_t(y)$ associated with ξ_t in the direction of η at point x on $[0, \tau)$ if for any $u \in \mathcal{M}^2(D, \sigma, b)$ the following process

$$(2.3) \quad u_{(\xi_t)(\xi_t)}(x_t(x)) + u_{(\eta_t)}(x_t(x)) + 2\xi_t^0 u_{(\xi_t)}(x_t(x)) + \eta_t^0 u(x_t(x)),$$

where ξ_t and ξ_t^0 are first quasiderivative and first adjoint process.

is a local martingale on $[0, \tau)$. In this case the process η_t^0 is called a **second adjoint process** for η_t . If $\tau = \tau(x)$ we simply say that η_t is a second quasiderivative of $x_t(y)$ associated with ξ_t in D in the direction of η at x .

Let us consider

$$u(x) = Eg(x_\tau(x)),$$

that is, we temporarily let $f = c = 0$ in (1.2). Based on the definitions above, if $u \in C^2(\bar{D})$, then the strong Markov property of $x_t(x)$ implies that $u \in \mathcal{M}^2(D)$, and the usual first and second “derivatives” with respect to x of $x_t(x)$, which are defined as the solutions of the Itô equations

$$\begin{aligned} \xi_t &= \xi + \int_0^t \sigma_{(\xi_s)}^k(x_s) dw_s^k + \int_0^t b_{(\xi_s)}(x_s) ds \\ \eta_t &= \eta + \int_0^t \left[\sigma_{(\xi_s)(\xi_s)}^k(x_s) + \sigma_{(\eta_s)}^k(x_s) \right] dw_s^k + \int_0^t \left[b_{(\xi_s)(\xi_s)}(x_s) + b_{(\eta_s)}(x_s) \right] ds \end{aligned}$$

are first and second quasiderivatives with zero adjoint processes. This means, the concept “quasiderivative” is a generalization of the usual “derivative”.

Now we additionally assume that the domain D is of class C^2 with ∂D bounded, $\tau(x) < \infty$ (a.s.), and g is twice continuously differentiable on ∂D .

If the process (2.2) is a uniformly integrable martingale on $[0, \tau(x))$ and $\xi_{\tau(x)}$ is tangent to ∂D at $x_{\tau(x)}(x)$ (a.s.), then we have

$$u_{(\xi)}(x) = E[u_{(\xi_\tau)}(x_\tau) + \xi_\tau^0 u(x_\tau)] = E[g_{(\xi_\tau)}(x_\tau) + \xi_\tau^0 g(x_\tau)].$$

This shows how we can apply first quasiderivatives to get interior estimates of $u_{(\xi)}$ through $|g|_{1,D}$ or $|g|_{1,\partial D}$.

As far as second derivatives are concerned, first notice that

$$4u_{(\xi)(\zeta)}(x) = u_{(\xi+\zeta)(\xi+\zeta)}(x) - u_{(\xi-\zeta)(\xi-\zeta)}(x).$$

So to estimate $u_{(\xi)(\zeta)}(x)$, $\forall \xi, \zeta \in \mathbb{R}^d$, it suffices to estimate $u_{(\xi)(\xi)}(x)$, $\forall \xi \in \mathbb{R}^d$.

Again, if the process (2.3) is a uniformly integrable martingale on $[0, \tau(x))$, $\xi_{\tau(x)}$ and $\eta_{\tau(x)}$ are tangent to ∂D at $x_{\tau(x)}(x)$ (a.s.), then by letting $\eta = 0$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} u_{(\xi)(\xi)}(x) &= u_{(\xi)(\xi)}(x) + u_{(\eta)}(x) \\ &= E[u_{(\xi_\tau)(\xi_\tau)}(x_\tau) + u_{(\eta_\tau)}(x_\tau) + 2\xi_\tau^0 u_{(\xi_\tau)}(x_\tau) + \eta_\tau^0 u(x_\tau)] \\ &= E[g_{(\xi_\tau)(\xi_\tau)}(x_\tau) + u_{(n(x_\tau))}(x_\tau) \cdot \xi_\tau^T D^2 h_{x_\tau}(0) \xi_\tau + g_{(\eta_\tau)}(x_\tau) \\ &\quad + 2\xi_\tau^0 g_{(\xi_\tau)}(x_\tau) + \eta_\tau^0 g(x_\tau)], \end{aligned}$$

where $n(x)$ is the unit inward normal at $x \in \partial D$ and $h_p : T_p(\partial D) \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ is a local representation of ∂D as a graph over tangent space of ∂D at p . (Notice that it is different from the first order case that generally $u_{(\xi_\tau)(\xi_\tau)}(x_\tau) \neq g_{(\xi_\tau)(\xi_\tau)}(x_\tau)$.) Since D is of class C^2 and ∂D is bounded,

$$\xi_\tau^T D^2 h_{x_\tau}(0) \xi_\tau \leq N |\xi_\tau|^2,$$

where N is constant. This shows how we can apply second quasiderivatives to get interior estimates of $u_{(\xi)(\zeta)}$ through $|g|_{2,D}$, or even $|g|_{2,\partial D}$, provided that $u_{(n(y))}(y)$ can be estimated on ∂D in terms of $|g|_{2,D}$ or $|g|_{2,\partial D}$.

It is also worth mentioning that $\eta_{\tau(x)}$ need not be tangent to ∂D at $x_{\tau(x)}(x)$, provided that we can control the moments of $\eta_{t \wedge \tau}$ and estimate the normal derivative of u , because we can write $\eta_{\tau(x)}$ as the sum of the tangential component and the normal component.

The discussion above motivates us on attempting to construct as many quasiderivatives as possible.

Theorem 2.1. *Let $r_t, \hat{r}_t, \pi_t, \hat{\pi}_t, P_t, \hat{P}_t$ be jointly measurable adapted processes with values in $\mathbb{R}, \mathbb{R}, \mathbb{R}^{d_1}, \mathbb{R}^{d_1}, \text{Skew}(d_1, \mathbb{R}), \text{Skew}(d_1, \mathbb{R})$, respectively,*

where $\text{Skew}(d_1, \mathbb{R})$ denotes the set of all $d_1 \times d_1$ skew-symmetric real matrices. Assume that

$$\int_0^T (|r_t|^4 + |\hat{r}_t|^2 + |\pi_t|^4 + |\hat{\pi}_t|^2 + |P_t|^4 + |\hat{P}_t|^2) dt < \infty$$

for any $T \in [0, \infty)$. For $x \in D$, $\xi \in \mathbb{R}^d$ and $\eta \in \mathbb{R}^d$, on the time interval $[0, \infty)$, define the process ξ_t and η_t as solutions of the following (linear) equations:

$$(2.4) \quad \xi_t = \xi + \int_0^t [\sigma_{(\xi_s)} + r_s \sigma + \sigma P_s] dw_s + \int_0^t [b_{(\xi_s)} + 2r_s b - \sigma \pi_s] ds,$$

$$(2.5) \quad \begin{aligned} \eta_t = \eta + \int_0^t & \left[\sigma_{(\eta_s)} + \hat{r}_s \sigma + \sigma \hat{P}_s + \sigma_{(\xi_s)}(\xi_s) + 2r_s \sigma_{(\xi_s)} \right. \\ & \left. + 2\sigma_{(\xi_s)} P_s + 2r_s \sigma P_s - r_s^2 \sigma + \sigma P_s^2 \right] dw_s \\ & + \int_0^t \left[b_{(\eta_s)} + 2\hat{r}_s b - \sigma \hat{\pi}_s + b_{(\xi_s)}(\xi_s) + 4r_s b_{(\xi_s)} \right. \\ & \left. - 2\sigma_{(\xi_s)} \pi_s - 2r_s \sigma \pi_s - 2\sigma P_s \pi_s \right] ds, \end{aligned}$$

where in σ, b and their derivatives we dropped the argument $x_s(x)$. Also define:

$$(2.6) \quad \xi_t^0 = \int_0^t \pi_s dw_s,$$

$$(2.7) \quad \eta_t^0 = (\xi_t^0)^2 - \langle \xi^0 \rangle_t + \int_0^t \hat{\pi}_s dw_s.$$

Then ξ_t is a first quasiderivative of $x_t(y)$ in D in the direction of ξ at x and ξ_t^0 is its first adjoint process, and η_t is a second quasiderivative of $x_t(y)$ associated with ξ_t in D in the direction of η at x and η_t^0 is its second adjoint process.

Remark 2.1. Equations (2.4) and (2.5) give the most general forms of the first and second quasiderivatives known so far. On one hand, they contain various auxiliary processes, $r_t, \pi_t, P_t, \hat{r}_t, \hat{\pi}_t, \hat{P}_t$, which supply us fruitful quasiderivatives for our applications. On the other hand, in specific applications, many of the auxiliary processes are defined to be zero (processes), which make the equations (2.4) and (2.5) shorter.

Proof. Mimic the proof of Theorem 3.2.1 in [11] by replacing $y_t(\varepsilon, x)$ as the solution to the Itô equation

$$\begin{aligned} dy_t = & \sqrt{1 + 2\varepsilon r_t + \varepsilon^2 \hat{r}_t \sigma(y_t)} e^{\varepsilon P_t} e^{\frac{1}{2} \varepsilon^2 \hat{P}_t} dw_t + \left[(1 + 2\varepsilon r_t + \varepsilon^2 \hat{r}_t) b(y_t) \right. \\ & \left. - \sqrt{1 + 2\varepsilon r_t + \varepsilon^2 \hat{r}_t \sigma(y_t)} e^{\varepsilon P_t} e^{\frac{1}{2} \varepsilon^2 \hat{P}_t} \left(\varepsilon \pi_t + \frac{1}{2} \varepsilon^2 \hat{\pi}_t \right) \right] dt \end{aligned}$$

with initial condition $y = x + \varepsilon\xi + \frac{1}{2}\varepsilon^2\eta$, and then differentiating the local martingale

$$u(y_t(\varepsilon, x)) \exp \left(\int_0^t (\varepsilon\pi_s + \frac{1}{2}\varepsilon^2\hat{\pi}_s)dw_s - \frac{1}{2} \int_0^t |\varepsilon\pi_s + \frac{1}{2}\varepsilon^2\hat{\pi}_s|^2 ds \right)$$

twice which turns out to be a local martingale also. $\square$

Before ending this section, we introduce two local martingales to be used in applications.

Theorem 2.2. *Let c, f, g and u be real-valued twice continuously differentiable functions in D . Suppose that u satisfies (1.1). Take the processes $r_t, \hat{r}_t, \pi_t, \hat{\pi}_t, P_t, \hat{P}_t, \xi_t, \eta_t, \xi_t^0, \eta_t^0$ from Theorem 2.1. Then for any $x \in D$, the processes*

(2.8)

$$\begin{aligned} X_t &:= e^{-\phi_t} \left[u_{(\xi_t)}(x_t) + \tilde{\xi}_t^0 u(x_t) \right] + \int_0^t e^{-\phi_s} \left[f_{(\xi_s)}(x_s) + (2r_s + \tilde{\xi}_s^0) f(x_s) \right] ds, \\ Y_t &:= e^{-\phi_t} \left[u_{(\xi_t)(\xi_t)}(x_t) + u_{(\eta_t)}(x_t) + 2\tilde{\xi}_t^0 u_{(\xi_t)}(x_t) + \tilde{\eta}_t^0 u(x_t) \right] \\ (2.9) \quad &+ \int_0^t e^{-\phi_s} \left[f_{(\xi_s)(\xi_s)}(x_s) + f_{(\eta_s)}(x_s) + (4r_s + 2\tilde{\xi}_s^0) f_{(\xi_s)}(x_s) \right. \\ &\quad \left. + (2\hat{r}_s + 4\tilde{\xi}_s^0 r_s + \tilde{\eta}_s^0) f(x_s) \right] ds, \end{aligned}$$

with

$$\begin{aligned} \phi_t &:= \int_0^t c(x_s) ds, \\ \xi_t^{d+1} &:= - \int_0^t c_{(\xi_s)}(x_s) + 2r_s c(x_s) ds, \\ \tilde{\xi}_t^0 &:= \xi_t^0 + \xi_t^{d+1}, \\ \eta_t^{d+1} &:= - \int_0^t c_{(\xi_s)(\xi_s)}(x_s) + c_{(\eta_s)}(x_s) + 4r_s c_{(\xi_s)}(x_s) + 2\hat{r}_s c(x_s) ds, \\ \tilde{\eta}_t^0 &:= \eta_t^0 + 2\xi_t^0 \xi_t^{d+1} + (\xi_t^{d+1})^2 + \eta_t^{d+1}, \end{aligned}$$

are local martingales on $[0, \tau_D(x))$. (We keep writing x_t in place of $x_t(x)$ and drop this argument in many places.)

Proof. Introduce two additional equations

$$x_t^{d+1} = - \int_0^t c(x_s) ds, \quad x_t^{d+2} = \int_0^t \exp(x_s^{d+1}) f(x_s) dt.$$

For $\bar{x} = (x, x^{d+1}, x^{d+2}) \in D \times \mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{R}$, define

$$\bar{u}(\bar{x}) = \exp(x^{d+1})u(x) + x^{d+2}.$$

Itô's formula and the assumption that $a^{ij}(x)u_{x^i x^j} + b^i(x)u_{x^i} - c(x)u + f(x) = 0$ in D imply that $\bar{u}(\bar{x}_t(x, 0, 0))$ is a local martingale on $[0, \tau_D(x))$. That means, $\bar{u}(\bar{x}_t) \in \mathcal{M}^2$.

According to definitions 2.2 and 2.3,

$$\bar{u}_{(\bar{\xi}_t)}(\bar{x}_t) + \xi_t^0 \bar{u}(\bar{x}_t) \text{ and } \bar{u}_{(\bar{\eta}_t)}(\bar{x}_t) + \bar{u}_{(\bar{\xi}_t)(\bar{\xi}_t)}(\bar{x}_t) + 2\xi_t^0 \bar{u}_{(\bar{\xi}_t)}(\bar{x}_t) + \eta_t^0 \bar{u}(\bar{x}_t)$$

are local martingales on $[0, \tau_D(x))$, where $\bar{\xi}_t = (\xi_t, \xi_t^{d+1}, \xi_t^{d+2})$ and $\bar{\eta}_t = (\eta_t, \eta_t^{d+1}, \eta_t^{d+2})$ are first and second quasiderivatives of $\bar{x}_t((x, 0, 0))$ in the directions of $\bar{\xi} = (\xi, 0, 0)$ and $\bar{\eta} = (\eta, 0, 0)$, respectively.

Direct computation leads to

$$\begin{aligned} \bar{u}_{(\bar{\xi}_t)}(\bar{x}_t) &= \exp(x_t^{d+1}) [u_{(\xi_t)}(x_t) + \xi_t^{d+1} u(x_t)] + \xi_t^{d+2}, \\ \bar{u}_{(\bar{\xi}_t)(\bar{\xi}_t)}(\bar{x}_t) &= \exp(x_t^{d+1}) [u_{(\xi_t)(\xi_t)}(x_t) + 2\xi_t^{d+1} u_{(\xi_t)}(x_t) + (\xi_t^{d+1})^2 u(x_t)], \\ \bar{u}_{(\bar{\eta}_t)}(\bar{x}_t) &= \exp(x_t^{d+1}) [u_{(\eta_t)}(x_t) + \eta_t^{d+1} u(x_t)] + \eta_t^{d+2}, \end{aligned}$$

with

$$\begin{aligned} \xi_t^{d+1} &= - \int_0^t c_{(\xi_s)}(x_s) + 2r_s c(x_s) ds, \\ \xi_t^{d+2} &= \int_0^t \exp(x_s^{d+1}) [f_{(\xi_s)}(x_s) + (\xi_s^{d+1} + 2r_s) f(x_s)] ds, \\ \eta_t^{d+1} &= - \int_0^t c_{(\xi_s)(\xi_s)}(x_s) + c_{(\eta_s)}(x_s) + 4r_s c_{(\xi_s)}(x_s) + 2\hat{r}_s c(x_s) ds, \\ \eta_t^{d+2} &= \int_0^t \exp(x_s^{d+1}) [f_{(\xi_s)(\xi_s)}(x_s) + f_{(\eta_s)}(x_s) + (2\xi_s^{d+1} + 4r_s) f_{(\xi_s)}(x_s) \\ &\quad + ((\xi_s^{d+1})^2 + \eta_s^{d+1} + 4r_s \xi_s^{d+1} + 2\hat{r}_s) f(x_s)] ds. \end{aligned}$$

It remains to notice that ξ_t^0 and η_t^0 are local martingales, so by Lemma II.8.5(c) in [10]

$$\xi_t^0 x_t^{d+2} - \int_0^t \xi_s^0 dx_s^{d+2}, \xi_t^0 \xi_t^{d+2} - \int_0^t \xi_s^0 d\xi_s^{d+2} \text{ and } \eta_t^0 x_t^{d+2} - \int_0^t \eta_s^0 dx_s^{d+2}$$

are local martingales. □

3. APPLICATION OF QUASIDERIVATIVES TO DERIVATIVE ESTIMATES OF NON-HOMOGENEOUS LINEAR DEGENERATE ELLIPTIC EQUATIONS

In this section, we use quasiderivative to derive first and second derivative estimates of (1.2), which is the probabilistic solution of (1.1).

To be precise, let σ , b and c in (1.2) and (1.3) be twice continuously differentiable in $\mathbb{R}^d$, and c be non-negative. Let $D \in C^4$ be a bounded domain in $\mathbb{R}^d$, then there exists a function $\psi \in C^4$ satisfying

$$\psi > 0 \text{ in } D, \quad \psi = 0 \text{ and } |\psi_x| \geq 1 \text{ on } \partial D.$$

We also assume that

$$(3.1) \quad L\psi := a^{ij}(x)\psi_{x^i x^j} + b^i(x)\psi_{x^i} \leq -1 \text{ in } D.$$

$$(3.2) \quad |\sigma^{ij}|_{2,D} + |b^i|_{2,D} + |c|_{2,D} + |\psi|_{4,D} \leq K_0,$$

with constant $K_0 \in [1, \infty)$.

Let $\mathfrak{B}$ be the set of all skew-symmetric $d_1 \times d_1$ matrices. For any positive constant λ , define

$$D_\lambda = \{x \in D : \psi(x) > \lambda\}.$$

Assumption 3.1. (*non-degeneracy along the normal to the boundary*)

$$(an, n) > 0 \text{ on } \partial D,$$

where n is the unit normal vector.

Assumption 3.2. (*interior condition to control the moments of quasiderivatives, weaker than the non-degeneracy*) There exist functions

- $\rho(x) : D \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^d$, bounded in D_λ for all $\lambda > 0$;
- $Q(x, y) : D \times \mathbb{R}^d \rightarrow \mathfrak{B}$, bounded with respect to x in D_λ for all $\lambda > 0, y \in \mathbb{R}^d$ and linear in y ;
- $M(x) : D \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$, bounded in D_λ for all $\lambda > 0$;

such that for any $x \in D$ and $|y| = 1$,

$$\begin{aligned} & \|\sigma_{(y)}(x) + (\rho(x), y)\sigma(x) + \sigma(x)Q(x, y)\|^2 + \\ & 2(y, b_{(y)}(x) + 2(\rho(x), y)b(x)) \leq c(x) + M(x)(a(x)y, y). \end{aligned}$$

Our main result is the following:

Theorem 3.1. Define u by (1.2), in which $x_t(x)$ is the solution of (1.3). Suppose that Assumption 3.1 and Assumption 3.2 are satisfied.

(1) If $f, g \in C^{0,1}(\bar{D})$, then $u \in C_{loc}^{0,1}(D)$, and for any $\xi \in \mathbb{R}^d$,

$$(3.3) \quad |u_{(\xi)}| \leq N \left(|\xi| + \frac{|\psi_{(\xi)}|}{\psi^{\frac{1}{2}}} \right) (|f|_{0,1,D} + |g|_{0,1,D}) \text{ a.e. in } D,$$

where $N = N(K_0, d, d_1, D)$.

(2) If $f, g \in C^{1,1}(\bar{D})$, then $u \in C_{loc}^{1,1}(D)$, and for any $\xi \in \mathbb{R}^d$,

$$(3.4) \quad |u_{(\xi)(\xi)}| \leq N \left(|\xi|^2 + \frac{\psi_{(\xi)}^2}{\psi} \right) (|f|_{1,1,D} + |g|_{1,1,D}) \text{ a.e. in } D,$$

where $N = N(K_0, d, d_1, D)$. Furthermore, u is the unique solution in $C_{loc}^{1,1}(D) \cap C^{0,1}(\bar{D})$ of

$$(3.5) \quad \begin{cases} Lu(x) - c(x)u(x) + f(x) = 0 & \text{a.e. in } D \\ u = g & \text{on } \partial D. \end{cases}$$

Remark 3.1. The author doesn't know whether the estimates (3.3) and (3.4) are sharp.

The following two remarks are reductions of Theorem 3.1.

Remark 3.2. Without loss of generality, we may assume that $c \geq 1$ and replace condition (3.2) by

$$(3.6) \quad \begin{aligned} & \left\| \sigma_{(y)}(x) + (\rho(x), y)\sigma(x) + \sigma(x)Q(x, y) \right\|^2 + \\ & 2(y, b_{(y)}(x) + 2(\rho(x), y)b(x)) \leq c(x) - 1 + M(x)(a(x)y, y). \end{aligned}$$

Indeed, letting $\tilde{u} = \frac{u}{\psi + 1}$ in D , we have

$$u_{xi} = (\psi + 1)\tilde{u}_{xi} + \psi_{xi}\tilde{u}, \quad u_{xixj} = (\psi + 1)\tilde{u}_{xixj} + \psi_{xj}\tilde{u}_{xi} + \psi_{xi}\tilde{u}_{xj} + \psi_{xixj}\tilde{u}$$

Hence (1.1) turns into

$$\begin{cases} \tilde{a}^{ij}(x)\tilde{u}_{xixj} + \tilde{b}^i(x)\tilde{u}_{xi} - \tilde{c}(x)\tilde{u} + f(x) &= 0, & \text{in } D \\ \tilde{u} &= \tilde{g} := g/(1 + \psi), & \text{on } \partial D \end{cases}$$

with

$$\tilde{a}^{ij} = (\psi + 1)a^{ij}, \quad \tilde{b}^i = 2a^{ij}\psi_{xj} + (\psi + 1)b^i, \quad \tilde{c} = -L\psi + (1 + \psi)c.$$

Notice that $\tilde{\sigma}^{ij} = \sqrt{\psi + 1}\sigma^{ij}$. So a direct computation implies that

$$|\tilde{\sigma}^{ij}|_{2,D} + |\tilde{b}^i|_{2,D} + |\tilde{c}|_{2,D} + |\psi|_{4,D} \leq (d^2 + 2d + 2)K_0^3,$$

which plays the same role as (3.2).

Since $L\psi \leq -1$ and $c \geq 0$, $\tilde{c} \geq 1$.

We also have $(\tilde{a}n, n) > 0$ on ∂D . Under the substitutions on σ , b and c , by inequality (3.2), we have

$$\begin{aligned} & \frac{1}{\psi + 1} \left\| \tilde{\sigma}_{(y)}(x) - \frac{1}{2} \frac{\psi_{(y)}}{\psi + 1} \tilde{\sigma}(x) + (\rho(x), y)\tilde{\sigma}(x) + \tilde{\sigma}(x)Q(x, y) \right\|^2 \\ & + \frac{2}{\psi + 1} \left(y, \tilde{b}_{(y)}(x) - \frac{\psi_{(y)}}{\psi + 1} \tilde{b}(x) + 2(\rho(x), y)\tilde{b}(x) \right) \\ & \leq \frac{\tilde{c}(x) + L\psi}{\psi + 1} + M(x)(a(x)y, y) + 2 \left(y, \left(\frac{2a\psi_x}{\psi + 1} \right)_{(y)} + 2(\rho(x), y) \frac{2a\psi_x}{\psi + 1} \right). \end{aligned}$$

Collecting similar terms and noticing that $L\psi \leq -1$, we get

$$\begin{aligned} & \left\| \tilde{\sigma}_{(y)}(x) + (\tilde{\rho}(x), y)\tilde{\sigma}(x) + \tilde{\sigma}(x)Q(x, y) \right\|^2 + 2 \left(y, \tilde{b}_{(y)}(x) + 2(\tilde{\rho}(x), y)\tilde{b}(x) \right) \\ & \leq \tilde{c}(x) - 1 + \tilde{M}(x)(\tilde{a}(x)y, y) + 4(\tilde{a}_{(y)}(x)\psi_x, y), \end{aligned}$$

with

$$\tilde{\rho}(x) := \rho(x) - \frac{\psi_x}{2(\psi + 1)},$$

and $\tilde{M}(x)$ is in terms of $M(x)$, K_0 and $|\rho(x)|$.

The term $4(\tilde{a}_{(y)}\psi_x, y)$ can not be bounded by $\tilde{M}(x)(\tilde{a}(x)y, y)$. However, notice that

$$\tilde{a}_{(y)}(x) = \tilde{\sigma}(x)\tilde{\sigma}_{(y)}^*(x).$$

So $\tilde{M}(x)(\tilde{a}(x)y, y) + 4(\tilde{a}_{(y)}\psi_x, y)$ can be rewritten in the form of

$$\left(\tilde{\sigma}(x) \left(\frac{\tilde{M}(x)}{2} \tilde{\sigma}^*(x)y + 4\tilde{\sigma}_{(y)}^*(x)\psi_x \right), y \right),$$

which can play the same role as that of $M(x)(a(x)y, y)$, which, in the proof, will be rewritten in the form of

$$\left(\sigma(x) \cdot \frac{M(x)}{2} \sigma^*(x)y, y \right).$$

A direct computation shows that if $\tilde{u}$ satisfies estimates (3.3) and (3.4), we have the same estimates for u .

Remark 3.3. Without loss of generality, we may assume that $u \in C^1(D)$ and $f, g \in C^1(\bar{D})$ when investigating first derivatives of u , and $u \in C^2(D)$ and $f, g \in C^2(\bar{D})$ when investigating second derivatives of u .

Let us take the first situation for example, in which u, f, g can be assumed to be of class C^1 . The second situation can be discussed by almost the same argument.

We define the process $x_t^\varepsilon(x)$ to be the solution to the equation

$$x_t = x_0 + \int_0^t \sigma(x_s) dw_s + \int_0^t \varepsilon I d\tilde{w}_s + \int_0^t b(x_s) ds$$

where $\tilde{w}_t$ is a d -dimensional Wiener process independent of w_t and I is the identity matrix of size $d \times d$, and we define $\tau^\varepsilon(x)$ to be the first exit time of $x_t^\varepsilon(x)$ from D , then for the function

$$u^\varepsilon(x) := E \left[g(x_{\tau^\varepsilon(x)}^\varepsilon(x)) e^{-\phi_{\tau^\varepsilon(x)}^\varepsilon} + \int_0^{\tau^\varepsilon(x)} f(x_t^\varepsilon(x)) e^{-\phi_t^\varepsilon} dt \right],$$

$$\text{with } \phi_t^\varepsilon := \int_0^t c(x_s^\varepsilon(x)) ds,$$

the relation $u^\varepsilon \rightarrow u$ holds as $\varepsilon \rightarrow 0$. Indeed, notice that

$$\begin{aligned} & E |g(x_{\tau^\varepsilon}^\varepsilon(x)) - g(x_\tau(x))| \\ & \leq K E (|x_{\tau^\varepsilon \wedge \tau}^\varepsilon(x) - x_{\tau^\varepsilon \wedge \tau}(x)| + (\tau^\varepsilon \vee \tau - \tau^\varepsilon \wedge \tau) + (\tau^\varepsilon \vee \tau - \tau^\varepsilon \wedge \tau)^{1/2}), \\ & E |e^{-\phi_{\tau^\varepsilon}^\varepsilon} - e^{-\phi_\tau}| \leq E e^{-\tau^\varepsilon \wedge \tau} |\phi_{\tau^\varepsilon}^\varepsilon - \phi_\tau| \\ & \leq K E e^{-\tau^\varepsilon \wedge \tau} (\tau^\varepsilon \wedge \tau \cdot \sup_{t \leq \tau^\varepsilon \wedge \tau} |x_t^\varepsilon(x) - x_t(x)| + (\tau^\varepsilon \vee \tau - \tau^\varepsilon \wedge \tau) + (\tau^\varepsilon \vee \tau - \tau^\varepsilon \wedge \tau)^{1/2}) \\ & \leq K E (\sup_{t \leq \tau^\varepsilon \wedge \tau} |x_t^\varepsilon(x) - x_t(x)| + (\tau^\varepsilon \vee \tau - \tau^\varepsilon \wedge \tau) + (\tau^\varepsilon \vee \tau - \tau^\varepsilon \wedge \tau)^{1/2}), \end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned} & E \left| \int_0^{\tau^\varepsilon} f(x_t^\varepsilon(x)) e^{-\phi_t^\varepsilon} dt - \int_0^\tau f(x_t(x)) e^{-\phi_t} dt \right| \\ & \leq E \int_0^{\tau^\varepsilon \wedge \tau} |f(x_t^\varepsilon(x)) e^{-\phi_t^\varepsilon} - f(x_t(x)) e^{-\phi_t}| dt \\ & \quad + K E (\tau^\varepsilon \vee \tau - \tau^\varepsilon \wedge \tau) + (\tau^\varepsilon \vee \tau - \tau^\varepsilon \wedge \tau)^{1/2}) \\ & \leq E \int_0^{\tau^\varepsilon \wedge \tau} K (|x_t^\varepsilon(x) - x_t(x)| + t \cdot \sup_{s \leq t} |x_s^\varepsilon(x) - x_s(x)|) e^{-t} dt \end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
& + KE(\tau^\varepsilon \vee \tau - \tau^\varepsilon \wedge \tau + (\tau^\varepsilon \vee \tau - \tau^\varepsilon \wedge \tau)^{1/2}) \\
& \leq KE(\sup_{t \leq \tau^\varepsilon \wedge \tau} |x_t^\varepsilon(x) - x_t(x)| + (\tau^\varepsilon \vee \tau - \tau^\varepsilon \wedge \tau) + (\tau^\varepsilon \vee \tau - \tau^\varepsilon \wedge \tau)^{1/2}),
\end{aligned}$$

where K is a constant depending on $|g|_{0,1,D}$, $|f|_{0,1,D}$ and K_0 . It follows that

$$\begin{aligned}
|u^\varepsilon(x) - u(x)| & \leq KE(\sup_{t \leq \tau^\varepsilon \wedge \tau} |x_t^\varepsilon(x) - x_t(x)| + (\tau^\varepsilon \vee \tau - \tau^\varepsilon \wedge \tau) + (\tau^\varepsilon \vee \tau - \tau^\varepsilon \wedge \tau)^{1/2}) \\
& \leq K \left(E \sup_{t \leq \tau^\varepsilon \wedge \tau \wedge T} |x_t^\varepsilon(x) - x_t(x)| + KP(\tau > T) + EI_1 + EI_2 + \sqrt{EI_1} + \sqrt{EI_2} \right),
\end{aligned}$$

where

$$\begin{aligned}
I_1 & = (\tau^\varepsilon \vee \tau - \tau^\varepsilon \wedge \tau) I_{\tau > \tau^\varepsilon} = (\tau - \tau^\varepsilon) I_{\tau > \tau^\varepsilon}, \\
I_2 & = (\tau^\varepsilon \vee \tau - \tau^\varepsilon \wedge \tau) I_{\tau < \tau^\varepsilon} = (\tau^\varepsilon - \tau) I_{\tau < \tau^\varepsilon}.
\end{aligned}$$

It remains to notice that

$$E \sup_{t \leq \tau^\varepsilon \wedge \tau \wedge T} |x_t(x) - x_t^\varepsilon(x)| \leq e^{KT} \varepsilon \rightarrow 0, \text{ as } \varepsilon \rightarrow 0,$$

$$P(\tau > T) \leq \frac{E\tau}{T} \leq \frac{1}{T} E \int_0^\tau (-L\psi(x_t(x))) dt = \frac{\psi(x) - \psi(x_\tau(x))}{T} \leq \frac{K_0}{T},$$

and

$$\begin{aligned}
E(\tau - \tau^\varepsilon) I_{\tau > \tau^\varepsilon} & = E \int_{\tau \wedge \tau^\varepsilon}^\tau 1 dt \\
& \leq -E \int_{\tau \wedge \tau^\varepsilon}^\tau L\psi(x_t(x)) dt \\
& = -E \left(\psi(x_\tau(x)) - \psi(x_{\tau^\varepsilon}(x)) \right) I_{\tau^\varepsilon < \tau} \\
& = E\psi(x_{\tau^\varepsilon}(x)) I_{\tau^\varepsilon < \tau} \\
& = E \left(\psi(x_{\tau^\varepsilon}(x)) - \psi(x_{\tau^\varepsilon}^\varepsilon(x)) \right) I_{\tau^\varepsilon < \tau} \\
& \leq E \left(\psi(x_{\tau^\varepsilon}(x)) - \psi(x_{\tau^\varepsilon}^\varepsilon(x)) \right) I_{\tau^\varepsilon < \tau \leq T} + 2K_0 P(\tau > T) \\
& \leq K_0 E \sup_{t \leq \tau^\varepsilon \wedge \tau \wedge T} |x_t(x) - x_t^\varepsilon(x)| + \frac{2K_0^2}{T} \\
E(\tau^\varepsilon - \tau) I_{\tau < \tau^\varepsilon} & \leq -2E \int_{\tau \wedge \tau^\varepsilon}^{\tau^\varepsilon} L^\varepsilon \psi(x_t^\varepsilon(x)) dt \\
& \leq \dots \leq K_0 E \sup_{t \leq \tau^\varepsilon \wedge \tau \wedge T} |x_t(x) - x_t^\varepsilon(x)| + \frac{2K_0^2}{T}.
\end{aligned}$$

Hence by first letting $\varepsilon \downarrow 0$ and then $T \uparrow \infty$, we conclude that

$$|u^\varepsilon(x) - u(x)| \rightarrow 0 \text{ as } \varepsilon \rightarrow 0.$$

Moreover, for small ε the condition (3.1) holds for 2ψ , taken instead of ψ and L^ε associated to the process $x_t^\varepsilon(x)$. The matrix σ^ε corresponding to the process $x_t^\varepsilon(x)$ is obtained by attaching the identity matrix, multiplied by ε , to the right of the original matrix σ . In this connection we modify $P(x, y)$ by

adding zero entries on the right and below to form a $(d_1+d) \times (d_1+d)$ matrix. Then the condition (3.6) corresponding to the process $x_t^\varepsilon(x)$ will differ from the original condition by the fact that the term $\varepsilon^2(\rho(x), y)^2 d$ appears on the left, and $\frac{1}{2}M(x)\varepsilon^2$ on the right. From this it is clear that the condition (3.6) for the process $x_t^\varepsilon(x)$ (for all ε) also holds when $M(x)$ is replaced by $M(x) + 2|\rho(x)|^2 d$.

Finally, from analysis of PDE, we know that for $\varepsilon \neq 0$ the nondegenerate elliptic equation $L^\varepsilon w = 0$ in D with the boundary condition $w = g$ on ∂D has a solution that is continuous in $\bar{D}$ and twice continuously differentiable in D , and $u^\varepsilon = w$ in D by Itô's formula. From this it follows that it suffices to prove the theorem for small $\varepsilon \neq 0$, the process $x_t^\varepsilon(x)$, and a function u^ε that is continuously differentiable in D . Of course, we must be sure that the constants N in (3.3) is chosen to be independent of ε , which is true as we can see in the proof of the theorem. Observing further that for each fixed $\varepsilon \neq 0$ the functions f and g can be uniformly approximated in $\bar{D}$ by infinitely differentiable functions, in such a way that the last factor in (3.3) increases by at most a factor of two when f and g are replaced by the approximating functions, while for the latter the function w (i.e., u^ε) has continuous and bounded first derivatives in $\bar{D}$, we conclude that we may assume u has continuous first derivatives in D and $f, g \in C^1(\bar{D})$ when investigating first derivatives of u .

Before proving the theorem, let us prove four lemmas. In Lemma 3.1 we estimate the first exit time. It is a well-known result, but we still prove for the sake of completeness. Lemma 3.2 concerns the estimate of the first derivative along the normal to the boundary, to be used when estimating the second derivatives. In Lemma 3.3 and Lemma 3.4, we construct two supermartingales, which will play the roles of barriers near the boundary and in the interior of the domain, respectively.

Lemma 3.1. *Let $\tau_{D_0}(x)$ be the first exit time of $x_t(x)$ from D_0 , which is a sub-domain of D containing x . Then we have*

$$E\tau_{D_0}(x) \leq E\tau_D(x) \leq \psi(x) \leq |\psi|_{0,D},$$

$$E\tau_{D_0}^2(x) \leq E\tau_D^2(x) \leq 2|\psi|_{0,D}\psi(x) \leq 2|\psi|_{0,D}^2.$$

Proof. The fact that $D_0 \subset D$ implies $E\tau_{D_0}(x) \leq E\tau_D(x)$ and $E\tau_{D_0}^2(x) \leq E\tau_D^2(x)$. Now we abbreviate $\tau_D(x)$ by $\tau(x)$, or simply τ when this will cause no confusion. By (3.1) and Itô's formula, we have

$$E\tau = E \int_0^\tau 1 dt \leq -E \int_0^\tau L\psi dt = \psi(x) - E\psi(x_\tau) = \psi(x),$$

$$E\tau^2 = 2E \int_0^\infty (\tau - t) I_{\tau > t} dt = 2E \int_0^\infty I_{\tau > t} E\tau(x_t) dt$$

$$\leq 2 \sup_{y \in D} E\tau(y) \cdot E \int_0^\infty I_{\tau > t} dt = 2 \sup_{y \in D} E\tau(y) \cdot E\tau \leq 2|\psi|_{0,D}\psi(x).$$

□

Lemma 3.2. *If $f, g \in C^2(\bar{D})$, and $u \in C^1(\bar{D})$, then for any $y \in \partial D$ we have*

$$(3.7) \quad |u_{(n)}(y)| \leq K(|g|_{2,D} + |f|_{0,D}),$$

where n is the unit inward normal on ∂D and the constant K depends only on K_0 .

Proof. Fix a $y \in \partial D$, and choose $\varepsilon_0 > 0$ so that $y + \varepsilon n \in D$ as long as $0 < \varepsilon \leq \varepsilon_0$. Also, fix an $\varepsilon \in (0, \varepsilon_0]$ and let $x := y + \varepsilon n$. By Itô's formula,

$$d(g(x_t)e^{-\phi_t}) = e^{-\phi_t}g_{(\sigma^k)}(x_t)dw_t^k + e^{-\phi_t}(Lg(x_t) - c(x_t)g(x_t))dt,$$

$$d(u(x_t)e^{-\phi_t}) = e^{-\phi_t}u_{(\sigma^k)}(x_t)dw_t^k + e^{-\phi_t}f(x_t)dt.$$

Notice that

$$E \int_0^\infty \left(e^{-\phi_t}g_{(\sigma^k)}(x_t) \right)^2 I_{t \leq \tau} dt \leq N|g|_{1,D}^2 E\tau < \infty,$$

$$E \int_0^\infty \left(e^{-\phi_t}u_{(\sigma^k)}(x_t) \right)^2 I_{t \leq \tau} dt \leq N|u|_{1,D}^2 E\tau < \infty.$$

The Wald identities hold:

$$E \int_0^\tau e^{-\phi_t}g_{(\sigma^k)}(x_t)dw_t^k = 0, \quad E \int_0^\tau e^{-\phi_t}u_{(\sigma^k)}(x_t)dw_t^k = 0.$$

Thus

$$\begin{aligned} u(x) &= g(x) + E \int_0^\tau e^{-\phi_t}(Lg(x_t(x)) - c(x_t(x))g(x_t(x)))dt \\ &\quad + E \int_0^\tau f(x_t(x))e^{-\phi_t}dt \\ &\leq g(x) + (|Lg|_{0,D} + |c|_{0,D}|g|_{0,D} + |f|_{0,D})E\tau \\ &\leq g(x) + K(|g|_{2,D} + |f|_{0,D})\psi(x). \end{aligned}$$

Notice that $u(y) = g(y)$ and $\psi(y) = 0$. So we have

$$\frac{u(y + \varepsilon n) - u(y)}{\varepsilon} \leq \frac{g(y + \varepsilon n) - g(y)}{\varepsilon} + K(|g|_{2,D} + |f|_{0,D})\frac{\psi(y + \varepsilon n) - \psi(y)}{\varepsilon}.$$

Letting $\varepsilon \downarrow 0$, we get

$$u_{(n)}(y) \leq K(|g|_{2,D} + |f|_{0,D}).$$

Replacing u with $-u$ yields the same estimate of $(-u)_{(n)}$ from above, which is an estimate of $u_{(n)}$ from below. Combining the estimates from above and from below leads to (3.7) and proves the lemma. □

For constants δ and λ , such that $0 < \delta < \lambda^2 < \lambda < 1$, define

$$\begin{aligned} D_\delta &= \{x \in D : \delta < \psi\}, \\ D^\lambda &= \{x \in D : \psi < \lambda\}, \\ D_\delta^\lambda &= \{x \in D : \delta < \psi < \lambda\}, \\ D_{\lambda^2} &= \{x \in D : \lambda^2 < \psi\}. \end{aligned}$$

Lemma 3.3. *Introduce*

$$\varphi(x) = \lambda^2 + \psi(1 - \frac{1}{4\lambda}\psi), \quad B_1(x, \xi) = [\lambda + \sqrt{\psi}(1 + \sqrt{\psi})]|\xi|^2 + K_1\varphi^{\frac{3}{2}}\frac{\psi^2(\xi)}{\psi},$$

where $K_1 \in [1, \infty)$ is a constant depending only on K_0 .

In D^λ , if we construct first and second quasiderivatives by (2.4) and (2.5), in which

$$r(x, \xi) := \rho(x, \xi) + \frac{\psi(\xi)}{\psi}, \quad r_t := r(x_t, \xi_t),$$

$$\text{where } \rho(x, \xi) := -\frac{1}{A} \sum_{k=1}^{d_1} \psi_{(\sigma^k)}(\psi_{(\sigma^k)})(\xi), \quad \text{with } A := \sum_{k=1}^{d_1} \psi_{(\sigma^k)}^2;$$

$$\hat{r}(x, \xi) := \frac{\psi^2(\xi)}{\psi^2}, \quad \hat{r}_t := \hat{r}(x_t, \xi_t);$$

$$\pi^k(x, \xi) := \frac{2\psi_{(\sigma^k)}\psi(\xi)}{\varphi\psi}, \quad k = 1, \dots, d_1, \quad \pi_t := \pi(x_t, \xi_t);$$

$$P^{ik}(x, \xi) := \frac{1}{A} [\psi_{(\sigma^k)}(\psi_{(\sigma^i)})(\xi) - \psi_{(\sigma^i)}(\psi_{(\sigma^k)})(\xi)], \quad i, k = 1, \dots, d_1, \quad P_t := P(x_t, \xi_t);$$

$$\hat{\pi}_t^k = \hat{P}_t^{ik} = 0, \quad \forall i, k = 1, \dots, d_1, \forall t \in [0, \infty).$$

Then for sufficiently small λ , when $x_0 \in D_\delta^\lambda$, $\xi_0 \in \mathbb{R}^d$ and $\eta_0 = 0$, we have

- (1) $B_1(x_t, \xi_t)$ and $\sqrt{B_1(x_t, \xi_t)}$ are local supermartingales on $[0, \tau_1^\delta]$, where $\tau_1^\delta = \tau_{D_\delta^\lambda}(x_0)$;
- (2) $E \int_0^{\tau_1^\delta} |\xi_t|^2 + \frac{\psi^2(\xi_t)}{\psi^2} dt \leq NB_1(x_0, \xi_0)$;
- (3) $E \sup_{t \leq \tau_1^\delta} |\xi_t|^2 \leq NB_1(x_0, \xi_0)$;
- (4) $E|\eta_{\tau_1^\delta}| \leq E \sup_{t \leq \tau_1^\delta} |\eta_t| \leq NB_1(x_0, \xi_0)$;
- (5) $E \left(\int_0^{\tau_1^\delta} |\eta_t|^2 dt \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} \leq NB_1(x_0, \xi_0)$;

where N is a constant depending on K_0 and λ .

Proof. Throughout the proof, keep in mind that the constant K depend only on K_0 , while the constants $N \in [1, \infty)$ and $\lambda_0 \in (0, 1)$ depend on K_0 and λ .

First, notice that, on ∂D , we have

$$A = \sum_{k=1}^{d_1} \psi_{(\sigma^k)}^2 = 2(a\psi_x, \psi_x) = 2|\psi_x|(an, n) \geq 2\delta,$$

where the constant $\delta > 0$, because of the compactness of ∂D . Replacing ψ by $\psi/2\delta$ if needed, we may, therefore, assume that $A \geq 1$.

By Itô's formula, for $t < \tau_1^\delta$, we have

$$d\psi_{(\xi_t)} = [(\psi_{(\sigma^i)})_{(\xi_t)} + r_t\psi_{(\sigma^i)} + \psi_{(\sigma^k)}P_t^{ki}]dw_t^i + [(L\psi)_{(\xi_t)} + 2r_tL\psi - \psi_{(\sigma^i)}\pi_t^i]dt.$$

A crucial fact about this equation is that owing to our choice of r and P

$$(\psi_{(\sigma^i)})_{(\xi_t)} + r_t\psi_{(\sigma^i)} + \psi_{(\sigma^k)}P_t^{ki} = \frac{\psi_{(\xi_t)}}{\psi}\psi_{(\sigma^i)}.$$

Thus

$$(3.8) \quad d\psi_{(\xi_t)} = \frac{\psi_{(\xi_t)}}{\psi}\psi_{(\sigma^i)}dw_t^i + [(L\psi)_{(\xi_t)} + 2r_tL\psi - \psi_{(\sigma^i)}\pi_t^i]dt.$$

Let

$$\bar{\sigma} := \sigma_{(\xi)} + r\sigma + \sigma P, \quad \bar{b} := b_{(\xi)} + 2rb.$$

We have

$$(3.9) \quad \|\bar{\sigma}\| \leq K(|\xi| + \frac{|\psi_{(\xi)}|}{\psi}),$$

$$(3.10) \quad |\bar{b}| \leq K(|\xi| + \frac{|\psi_{(\xi)}|}{\psi}).$$

By Itô's formula,

$$(3.11) \quad dB_1(x_t, \xi_t) = \Gamma_1(x_t, \xi_t)dt + \Lambda_1^k(x_t, \xi_t)dw_t^k$$

with

$$\Gamma_1(x, \xi) = I_1 + I_2 + \dots + I_{13}$$

where

$$I_1 = \lambda[2(\xi, \bar{b}) + \|\bar{\sigma}\|^2] \leq \lambda K(|\xi|^2 + \frac{\psi_{(\xi)}^2}{\psi^2}) \leq K\lambda^{\frac{5}{2}}\frac{|\xi|^2}{\psi^{\frac{3}{2}}} + K\varphi^{\frac{1}{2}}\frac{\psi_{(\xi)}^2}{\psi^2},$$

here we apply (3.9), (3.10) and $\lambda \leq \varphi^{\frac{1}{2}}$,

$$\begin{aligned} I_2 &= -\lambda 2(\xi, \sigma^k)\pi^k \leq \frac{K\lambda|\xi||\psi_{(\xi)}|}{\varphi\psi} \leq \frac{\lambda^2|\xi|^2}{32 \cdot 2^{\frac{3}{2}}\varphi^{\frac{5}{2}}} + \frac{K\varphi^{\frac{1}{2}}\psi_{(\xi)}^2}{\psi^2} \\ &\leq \frac{|\xi|^2}{32 \cdot 2^{\frac{3}{2}}\varphi^{\frac{3}{2}}} + \frac{K\varphi^{\frac{1}{2}}\psi_{(\xi)}^2}{\psi^2} \leq \frac{|\xi|^2}{32\psi^{\frac{3}{2}}} + K\varphi^{\frac{1}{2}}\frac{\psi_{(\xi)}^2}{\psi^2}, \end{aligned}$$

here we apply $\lambda^2 \leq \varphi$, and then observe that $\psi \leq 2\varphi$,

$$I_3 = \sqrt{\psi}(1 + \sqrt{\psi})2(\xi, \bar{b}) \leq \sqrt{\psi}K|\xi|(|\xi| + \frac{|\psi_{(\xi)}|}{\psi}) \leq K\lambda\frac{|\xi|^2}{\psi^{\frac{3}{2}}},$$

here we apply (3.10),

$$\begin{aligned} I_4 &= -\sqrt{\psi}(1 + \sqrt{\psi})2(\xi, \sigma^k)\pi^k \leq \frac{K\sqrt{\psi}|\xi||\psi_{(\xi)}|}{\varphi\psi} \leq \frac{\psi|\xi|^2}{32 \cdot 2^{\frac{5}{2}}\varphi^{\frac{5}{2}}} + \frac{K\varphi^{\frac{1}{2}}\psi_{(\xi)}^2}{\psi^2} \\ &\leq \frac{|\xi|^2}{32\psi^{\frac{3}{2}}} + K\varphi^{\frac{1}{2}}\frac{\psi_{(\xi)}^2}{\psi^2}, \end{aligned}$$

here we observe that $\psi \leq 2\varphi$,

$$I_5 = \sqrt{\psi}(1 + \sqrt{\psi})\|\bar{\sigma}\|^2 \leq K\sqrt{\psi}(|\xi|^2 + \frac{\psi_{(\xi)}^2}{\psi^2}) \leq K\lambda^2\frac{|\xi|^2}{\psi^{\frac{3}{2}}} + K\varphi^{\frac{1}{2}}\frac{\psi_{(\xi)}^2}{\psi^2},$$

here we apply (3.9),

$$I_6 = (1 + 2\sqrt{\psi})|\xi|^2[\frac{L\psi}{2\sqrt{\psi}} - \frac{A}{8\psi^{\frac{3}{2}}}] \leq -\frac{|\xi|^2}{8\psi^{\frac{3}{2}}},$$

$$I_7 = \frac{A}{4\psi}|\xi|^2 \leq K\frac{|\xi|^2}{\psi} \leq K\sqrt{\lambda}\frac{|\xi|^2}{\psi^{\frac{3}{2}}},$$

$$I_8 = (1 + 2\sqrt{\psi})\frac{\psi_{(\sigma^k)}}{\sqrt{\psi}}(\xi, \bar{\sigma}^k) \leq K\frac{|\xi|}{\sqrt{\psi}}(|\xi| + \frac{|\psi_{(\xi)}|}{\psi}) \leq K\lambda\frac{|\xi|^2}{\psi^{\frac{3}{2}}} + \frac{|\xi|^2}{32\psi^{\frac{3}{2}}} + K\varphi^{\frac{1}{2}}\frac{\psi_{(\xi)}^2}{\psi^2},$$

here we apply (3.9) and $\psi \leq 2\varphi$,

$$I_9 = K_1\frac{3}{2}\varphi^{\frac{1}{2}}[(1 - \frac{\psi}{2\lambda})L\psi - \frac{A}{4\lambda}]\frac{\psi_{(\xi)}^2}{\psi} + K_1\varphi^{\frac{3}{2}}3\frac{\psi_{(\xi)}^2}{\psi^2}L\psi \leq 0,$$

$$I_{10} = K_1\frac{3}{8}\varphi^{-\frac{1}{2}}(1 - \frac{\psi}{2\lambda})^2A\frac{\psi_{(\xi)}^2}{\psi} \leq K_1\frac{3}{8}\frac{\psi}{\varphi^{\frac{1}{2}}}A\frac{\psi_{(\xi)}^2}{\psi^2} \leq K_1\frac{3}{4}\varphi^{\frac{1}{2}}A\frac{\psi_{(\xi)}^2}{\psi^2},$$

here we use $\psi \leq 2\varphi$,

$$\begin{aligned} I_{11} &= K_1\varphi^{\frac{3}{2}}2\frac{\psi_{(\xi)}}{\psi}[(L\psi)_{(\xi)} + 2\rho L\psi] \leq K_1K\varphi^{\frac{3}{2}}\frac{|\psi_{(\xi)}|}{\psi}|\xi| \leq K_1K\lambda\varphi^{\frac{1}{2}}\frac{|\psi_{(\xi)}|}{\psi}|\xi| \\ &\leq K_1\lambda\varphi^{\frac{1}{2}}\frac{\psi_{(\xi)}^2}{\psi^2} + K_1K\lambda^3\frac{|\xi|^2}{\psi^{\frac{3}{2}}}, \end{aligned}$$

here we first notice that $\varphi \leq 2\lambda$, and then apply $\psi \leq 2\varphi$,

$$I_{12} = -K_1\varphi^{\frac{3}{2}}\frac{4}{\varphi}A\frac{\psi_{(\xi)}^2}{\psi^2} = -K_14\varphi^{\frac{1}{2}}A\frac{\psi_{(\xi)}^2}{\psi^2},$$

$$I_{13} = K_1\frac{3}{2}\varphi^{\frac{1}{2}}(1 - \frac{\psi}{2\lambda})A\frac{\psi_{(\xi)}^2}{\psi^2} \leq K_1\frac{3}{2}\varphi^{\frac{1}{2}}A\frac{\psi_{(\xi)}^2}{\psi^2}.$$

Collecting our estimates above we see that, when $x \in D_\delta^\lambda$,

$$\Gamma_1(x, \xi) \leq \left[K(\lambda^{\frac{5}{2}} + \sqrt{\lambda}) + K_1K\lambda^3 + \left(\frac{3}{32} - \frac{1}{8} \right) \right] \frac{|\xi|^2}{\psi^{\frac{3}{2}}}$$

$$+ \left[K + K_1 \lambda + K_1 A \left(\frac{3}{4} + \frac{3}{2} - 4 \right) \right] \varphi^{\frac{1}{2}} \frac{\psi_{(\xi)}^2}{\psi^2}.$$

Recall that K and K_1 depend only on K_0 . By first choosing K_1 such that $K_1 \geq K$, then letting λ be sufficiently small, we get

$$(3.12) \quad \Gamma_1(x, \xi) \leq -\frac{1}{64} \frac{|\xi|^2}{\psi^{\frac{3}{2}}} - \frac{1}{2} \varphi^{\frac{1}{2}} \frac{\psi_{(\xi)}^2}{\psi^2} \leq -\frac{1}{64\lambda^{\frac{3}{2}}} |\xi|^2 - \frac{\lambda}{2} \frac{\psi_{(\xi)}^2}{\psi^2} \leq 0.$$

It follows that $B_1(x_t, \xi_t)$ is a local supermartingale on $[0, \tau_1^\delta]$.

Also, notice that $f(x) = \sqrt{x}$ is concave, so $\sqrt{B_1(x_t, \xi_t)}$ is a local supermartingale on $[0, \tau_1^\delta]$. Thus (1) is proved.

From (3.12), there exists a sufficiently small positive λ_0 , such that

$$\Gamma_1(x, \xi) + \lambda_0 (|\xi|^2 + \frac{\psi_{(\xi)}^2}{\psi^2}) \leq 0, \forall x \in D_\delta^\lambda.$$

Therefore,

$$\begin{aligned} \lambda_0 E \int_0^{\tau_1^\delta} |\xi_t|^2 + \frac{\psi_{(\xi_t)}^2}{\psi^2} dt &\leq -E \int_0^{\tau_1^\delta} \Gamma_1(x_t, \xi_t) \\ &= B_1(x_0, \xi_0) - EB_1(x_{\tau_1^\delta}, \xi_{\tau_1^\delta}) \leq B_1(x_0, \xi_0), \end{aligned}$$

which proves (2).

Since

$$|\xi_t|^2 = |\xi_0|^2 + \int_0^t 2(\xi_s, \bar{b}) + \|\bar{\sigma}\|^2 ds + \int_0^t 2(\xi_s, \bar{\sigma}) dw_s,$$

by Burkholder-Davis-Gundy inequality, for $\tau_n = \tau_1^\delta \wedge \inf\{t \geq 0 : |\xi_t| \geq n\}$, we have,

$$\begin{aligned} E \sup_{t \leq \tau_n} |\xi_t|^2 &\leq |\xi_0|^2 + \int_0^{\tau_n} \left(2|\xi_t| \cdot |\bar{b}| + \|\bar{\sigma}\|^2 \right) dt + 6E \left(\int_0^{\tau_n} |(\xi_t, \bar{\sigma})|^2 \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} \\ &\leq |\xi_0|^2 + NE \int_0^{\tau_n} |\xi_t|^2 + \frac{\psi_{(\xi_t)}^2}{\psi^2} dt + E \left(\int_0^{\tau_n} N |\xi_t|^2 (|\xi_t|^2 + \frac{\psi_{(\xi_t)}^2}{\psi^2}) dt \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} \\ &\leq NB_1(x_0, \xi_0) + E \left[\sup_{t \leq \tau_n} |\xi_t| \cdot \left(\int_0^{\tau_n} N (|\xi_t|^2 + \frac{\psi_{(\xi_t)}^2}{\psi^2}) dt \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} \right] \\ &\leq NB_1(x_0, \xi_0) + \frac{1}{2} E \sup_{t \leq \tau_n} |\xi_t|^2 + \frac{1}{2} E \left(\int_0^{\tau_n} N (|\xi_t|^2 + \frac{\psi_{(\xi_t)}^2}{\psi^2}) dt \right) \\ &\leq NB_1(x_0, \xi_0) + \frac{1}{2} E \sup_{t \leq \tau_n} |\xi_t|^2, \end{aligned}$$

which implies that

$$E \sup_{t \leq \tau_n} |\xi_t|^2 \leq NB_1(x_0, \xi_0).$$

Now (3) is obtained by letting $n \rightarrow \infty$.

Now we estimate the moments of second quasiderivative η_t . Based on our definition, we have

$$d\eta_t = [\sigma_{(\eta_t)} + G(x_t, \xi_t)]dw_t + [b_{(\eta_t)} + H(x_t, \xi_t)]dt,$$

with

$$G(x, \xi) = \sigma_{(\xi)}(\xi) + 2r\sigma_{(\xi)} + (2\sigma_{(\xi)} + 2r\sigma + \sigma P)P + (\hat{r} - r^2)\sigma,$$

$$H(x, \xi) = b_{(\xi)}(\xi) + 4rb_{(\xi)} + 2\frac{\psi_{(\xi)}^2}{\psi^2}b.$$

Therefore, we have the estimates

$$\|G\| \leq N|\xi|(|\xi| + \frac{|\psi_{(\xi)}|}{\psi}), \quad |H| \leq N(|\xi|^2 + \frac{\psi_{(\xi)}^2}{\psi^2}).$$

Itô's formula implies

$$d(|\eta_t|^2 e^{2\varphi}) = \theta(x_t, \xi_t, \eta_t)dt + \mu^k(x_t, \xi_t, \eta_t)dw_t^k,$$

where

$$\begin{aligned} \theta(x, \xi, \eta) = e^{2\varphi} \Big\{ 2|\eta|^2 \Big[(1 - \frac{\psi}{2\lambda})L\psi - \frac{A}{4\lambda} + (1 - \frac{\psi}{2\lambda})^2 A \Big] + \|\sigma_{(\eta)} + G(x, \xi)\|^2 \\ + 2(\eta, b_{(\eta)} + H(x, \xi)) + 2(\eta, \sigma_{(\eta)} + G(x, \xi))[(1 - \frac{\psi}{2\lambda})\psi_{(\sigma^k)}] \Big\}. \end{aligned}$$

It is not hard to see that, for any $x \in D_\delta^\lambda$,

$$\theta(x, \xi, \eta) \leq e^{2\varphi} \Big\{ 2(1 - \frac{1}{4\lambda})A|\eta|^2 + N[|\eta|^2 + |\xi|^2(|\xi|^2 + \frac{\psi_{(\xi)}^2}{\psi^2}) + |\eta|(|\xi|^2 + \frac{\psi_{(\xi)}^2}{\psi^2})] \Big\}.$$

So for sufficiently small λ , we have

$$\theta(x, \xi, \eta) + \lambda_0|\eta|^2 \leq Ne^{2\varphi}(|\xi|^2 + |\eta|)(|\xi|^2 + \frac{\psi_{(\xi)}^2}{\psi^2}).$$

Then for any bounded stopping time γ with respect to $\{\mathcal{F}_t\}$, we have

$$E(e^{2\varphi}|\eta_\gamma|^2) + \lambda_0 E \int_0^\gamma |\eta_t|^2 dt \leq E \int_0^\gamma Ne^{2\varphi}(|\xi_t|^2 + |\eta_t|)(|\xi_t|^2 + \frac{\psi_{(\xi_t)}^2}{\psi^2}) dt.$$

Let $\tau_n = \tau_1^\delta \wedge \inf\{t \geq 0 : e^\varphi|\eta_t| \geq n\}$. Recall that $\eta_0 = 0$. By Theorem III.6.8 in [10], we have

$$\begin{aligned} & E \sup_{t \leq \tau_n} (e^\varphi|\eta_t|) \\ & \leq 3E \left(\int_0^{\tau_n} Ne^{2\varphi}(|\xi_t|^2 + |\eta_t|)(|\xi_t|^2 + \frac{\psi_{(\xi_t)}^2}{\psi^2}) dt \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} \\ & \leq E \left[\left(\int_0^{\tau_n} 9Ne^{2\varphi}|\xi_t|^2(|\xi_t|^2 + \frac{\psi_{(\xi_t)}^2}{\psi^2}) dt \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} + \left(\int_0^{\tau_n} 9Ne^{2\varphi}|\eta_t|(|\xi_t|^2 + \frac{\psi_{(\xi_t)}^2}{\psi^2}) dt \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} \right] \\ & \leq E \left[N \sup_{t \leq \tau_n} |\xi_t| \cdot \left(\int_0^{\tau_n} |\xi_t|^2 + \frac{\psi_{(\xi_t)}^2}{\psi^2} dt \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} + \sup_{t \leq \tau_n} \sqrt{e^\varphi|\eta_t|} \cdot \left(\int_0^{\tau_n} N(|\xi_t|^2 + \frac{\psi_{(\xi_t)}^2}{\psi^2}) dt \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} \right] \end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
&\leq NE \sup_{t \leq \tau_n} |\xi_t|^2 + NE \int_0^{\tau_n} |\xi_t|^2 + \frac{\psi_{(\xi_t)}^2}{\psi^2} dt + \frac{1}{2} E \sup_{t \leq \tau_n} (e^\varphi |\eta_t|) \\
&\leq \frac{1}{2} E \sup_{t \leq \tau_n} (e^\varphi |\eta_t|) + NB_1(x_0, \xi_0),
\end{aligned}$$

which implies that

$$\begin{aligned}
E \sup_{t \leq \tau_n} |\eta_t| &\leq E \sup_{t \leq \tau_n} (e^\varphi |\eta_t|) \leq NB_1(x_0, \xi_0), \\
E \left(\int_0^{\tau_n} |\eta_t|^2 dt \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} &\leq NB_1(x_0, \xi_0).
\end{aligned}$$

Letting $n \rightarrow \infty$, we conclude that (4) and (5) are true. $\square$

Lemma 3.4. *Introduce*

$$B_2(x, \xi) = \lambda^{\frac{3}{4}} |\xi|^2.$$

If we construct first and second quasiderivatives by (2.4) and (2.5), in which

$$\begin{aligned}
r(x, y) &:= (\rho(x), y), \quad r_t := r(x_t, \xi_t), \quad \hat{r}_t := r(x_t, \eta_t), \\
\pi(x, y) &:= \frac{M(x)}{2} \sigma^*(x) y, \quad \pi_t := \pi(x_t, \xi_t), \quad \hat{\pi}_t := \pi(x_t, \eta_t), \\
P(x, y) &:= Q(x, y), \quad P_t := P(x_t, \xi_t), \quad \hat{P}_t := P(x_t, \eta_t).
\end{aligned}$$

Then for sufficiently small λ , when $x_0 \in D_{\lambda^2}$, $\xi_0 \in \mathbb{R}^d$ and $\eta_0 = 0$, we have

- (1) $e^{-\phi_t} B_2(x_t, \xi_t)$ and $\sqrt{e^{-\phi_t} B_2(x_t, \xi_t)}$ are local supermartingales on $[0, \tau_2]$, where $\tau_2 = \tau_{D_{\lambda^2}}(x)$;
- (2) $E \int_0^{\tau_2} e^{-\phi_t} |\xi_t|^2 dt \leq NB_2(x_0, \xi_0)$;
- (3) $E \sup_{t \leq \tau_2} e^{-\phi_t} |\xi_t|^2 \leq NB_2(x_0, \xi_0)$;
- (4) $E e^{-\phi_{\tau_2}} |\eta_{\tau_2}| \leq E \sup_{t \leq \tau_2} e^{-\phi_t} |\eta_t| \leq NB_2(x_0, \xi_0)$;
- (5) $E \left(\int_0^{\tau_2} e^{-2\phi_t} |\eta_t|^2 dt \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} \leq NB_2(x_0, \xi_0)$;
- (6) *The above inequalities are still all true if we replace ϕ_t by $\phi_t - \frac{1}{2}t$. More precisely, we have*

$$E \int_0^{\tau_2} e^{-\phi_t + \frac{1}{2}t} |\xi_t|^2 dt \leq NB_2(x_0, \xi_0), \quad E \sup_{t \leq \tau_2} e^{-\phi_t + \frac{1}{2}t} |\xi_t|^2 \leq NB_2(x_0, \xi_0),$$

$$E \left(\int_0^{\tau_2} e^{-2\phi_t + t} |\eta_t|^2 dt \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} \leq NB_2(x_0, \xi_0), \quad E \sup_{t \leq \tau_2} e^{-\phi_t + \frac{1}{2}t} |\eta_t| \leq NB_2(x_0, \xi_0),$$

where N is constant depending on K_0 and λ .

Proof. First of all, replacing K_0 by

$$\max \left\{ K_0, \sup_{x \in D_{\lambda^2}} |\rho(x)|, \sup_{x \in D_{\lambda^2}, y \in \mathbb{R}^d} \frac{\|Q(x, y)\|}{|y|}, \sup_{x \in D_{\lambda^2}} M(x) \right\},$$

we may assume that

$$\sup_{x \in D_{\lambda^2}} |\rho(x)| \leq K_0, \quad \sup_{x \in D_{\lambda^2}} \|Q(x, y)\| \leq K_0|y|, \forall y \in \mathbb{R}^d, \quad \sup_{x \in D_{\lambda^2}} M(x) \leq K_0.$$

By Itô's formula, for $t < \tau_2$, we have

$$d|\xi_t|^2 = \Lambda_2^k(x_t, \xi_t)dw_t^k + \Gamma_2(x_t, \xi_t)dt,$$

where

$$\Lambda_2(x, \xi) = 2(\xi_t, \sigma_{(\xi_t)} + r_t\sigma + \sigma P_t),$$

$$\Gamma_2(x, \xi) = [2(\xi, b_{(\xi)} + 2rb - \sigma\pi) + \|\sigma_{(\xi)} + r\sigma + \sigma P\|^2] \leq (c-1)|\xi|^2.$$

So

$$(3.13) \quad \begin{aligned} d(e^{-\phi_t}|\xi_t|^2) &= e^{-\phi_t}[\Gamma_2(x_t, \xi_t) - c(x_t)|\xi_t|^2]dt + dm_t \\ &\leq -e^{-\phi_t}|\xi_t|^2dt + dm_t, \end{aligned}$$

where m_t is a local martingale.

Thus $e^{-\phi_t}B_2(x_t, \xi_t)$ is a local supermartingale on $[0, \tau_2]$.

Also, notice that $f(x) = \sqrt{x}$ is concave, so $\sqrt{e^{-\phi_t}B_2(x_t, \xi_t)}$ is a local supermartingale on $[0, \tau_2]$. (1) is proved.

From (3.13), we also have

$$E \int_0^{\tau_2} e^{-\phi_t}|\xi_t|^2dt = B_2(x_0, \xi_0) - Ee^{-\phi_{\tau_2}}B_2(x_{\tau_2}, \xi_{\tau_2}) \leq B_2(x_0, \xi_0),$$

which proves (2).

Since

$$e^{-\phi_t}|\xi_t|^2 = |\xi_0|^2 + \int_0^t e^{-\phi_s}[2(\xi_s, \bar{b}) + \|\bar{\sigma}\|^2 - c|\xi_s|^2]ds + \int_0^t e^{-\phi_s}2(\xi_s, \bar{\sigma})dw_s,$$

by Burkholder-Davis-Gundy inequality, for $\tau_n = \tau_2 \wedge \inf\{t \geq 0 : |\xi_t| \geq n\}$, we have,

$$\begin{aligned} E \sup_{t \leq \tau_n} e^{-\phi_t}|\xi_t|^2 &\leq |\xi_0|^2 + \int_0^{\tau_n} e^{-\phi_t}[2|\xi_t| \cdot |\bar{b}| + \|\bar{\sigma}\|^2 + c|\xi_t|^2]dt \\ &\quad + 12E\left(\int_0^{\tau_n} e^{-2\phi_t}|(\xi_t, \bar{\sigma})|^2dt\right)^{\frac{1}{2}} \\ &\leq |\xi_0|^2 + NE \int_0^{\tau_n} e^{-\phi_t}|\xi_t|^2dt + E\left(\int_0^{\tau_n} Ne^{-2\phi_t}|\xi_t|^4dt\right)^{\frac{1}{2}} \\ &\leq NB_2(x_0, \xi_0) + E\left[\sup_{t \leq \tau_n} e^{-\frac{1}{2}\phi_t}|\xi_t| \cdot \left(\int_0^{\tau_n} Ne^{-\phi_t}|\xi_t|^2dt\right)^{\frac{1}{2}}\right] \\ &\leq NB_2(x_0, \xi_0) + \frac{1}{2}E \sup_{t \leq \tau_n} e^{-\phi_t}|\xi_t|^2 + \frac{1}{2}E\left(\int_0^{\tau_n} Ne^{-\phi_t}|\xi_t|^2dt\right) \\ &\leq NB_2(x_0, \xi_0) + \frac{1}{2}E \sup_{t \leq \tau_n} e^{-\phi_t}|\xi_t|^2, \end{aligned}$$

which implies that

$$E \sup_{t \leq \tau_n} e^{-\phi_t} |\xi_t|^2 \leq NB_2(x_0, \xi_0).$$

So (3) is true by letting $n \rightarrow \infty$.

Now we estimate the moments of the second quasiderivative η_t . Based on our definition, we have

$$d\eta_t = [\tilde{\sigma} + G]dw_t + [\tilde{b} + H]dt,$$

where

$$\begin{aligned} \tilde{\sigma} &= \bar{\sigma}(x, \eta) = \sigma_{(\eta)} + \hat{r}\sigma + \sigma\hat{P}, \\ \tilde{b} &= \bar{b}(x, \eta) = b_{(\eta)} + 2\hat{r}b - \sigma\hat{\pi}, \\ G &= G(x, \xi) = \sigma_{(\xi)}(\xi) + 2r\sigma_{(\xi)} - r^2\sigma + (2\sigma_{(\xi)} + 2r\sigma + \sigma P)P, \\ H &= H(x, \xi) = b_{(\xi)}(\xi) + 4rb_{(\xi)} - 2(\sigma_{(\xi)} + r\sigma - \sigma P)\pi. \end{aligned}$$

From the expressions above, we have the estimates

$$\|G\| \leq N|\xi|^2, \quad |H| \leq N|\xi|^2.$$

Hence Itô's formula implies

$$d(e^{-2\phi_t} |\eta_t|^2) = e^{-2\phi_t} [2(\eta_t, \tilde{b} + H) + \|\tilde{\sigma} + G\|^2 - 2c|\eta_t|^2] dt + 2e^{-2\phi_t} (\eta_t, \tilde{\sigma} + G) dw_t^k.$$

Notice that

$$\begin{aligned} &2(\eta, \tilde{b} + H) + \|\tilde{\sigma} + G\|^2 - 2c|\eta|^2 \\ &= 2(\eta, \tilde{b}) + \|\tilde{\sigma}\|^2 - 2c|\eta|^2 + 2(\eta, H) + |H|^2 + 2(\tilde{\sigma}^k, G^k) \\ &\leq (c-1)|\eta|^2 - 2c|\eta|^2 + |\eta|^2 + N|\xi|^4 \\ &\leq -|\eta|^2 + N|\xi|^4. \end{aligned}$$

So for any bounded stopping time γ with respect to $\{\mathcal{F}_t\}$, we have

$$E e^{-2\phi_\gamma} |\eta_\gamma|^2 + E \int_0^\gamma e^{-2\phi_t} |\eta_t|^2 dt \leq E \int_0^\gamma N e^{-2\phi_t} |\xi_t|^4 dt.$$

Recall that $\eta_0 = 0$. By Theorem III.6.8 in [10], we have

$$\begin{aligned} E \sup_{t \leq \tau_2} e^{-\phi_t} |\eta_t| &\leq 3E \left(\int_0^{\tau_2} N e^{-2\phi_t} |\xi_t|^4 dt \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} \\ &\leq E \left[\sup_{t \leq \tau_2} e^{-\frac{1}{2}\phi_t} |\xi_t| \cdot \left(\int_0^{\tau_2} 9N e^{-\phi_t} |\xi_t|^2 dt \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} \right] \\ &\leq \frac{1}{2} E \sup_{t \leq \tau_2} e^{-\phi_t} |\xi_t|^2 + \frac{1}{2} E \int_0^{\tau_2} 9N e^{-\phi_t} |\xi_t|^2 dt \\ &\leq NB_2(x_0, \xi_0), \end{aligned}$$

$$E \left(\int_0^{\tau_2} e^{-2\phi_t} |\eta_t|^2 dt \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} \leq 3E \left(\int_0^{\tau_2} N e^{-2\phi_t} |\xi_t|^4 dt \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} \leq NB_2(x_0, \xi_0),$$

which implies that (4) and (5) are true.

Finally, rewritting $c-1$ by $(c-\frac{1}{2})-\frac{1}{2}$ and repeating the argument above, we conclude that (6) is true. $\square$

Now we are ready to prove the theorem.

Proof of (3.3). Denote $\tau_{D_\delta^\lambda}(x)$ and $\tau_{D_{\lambda^2}}(x)$ by τ_1^δ and τ_2 , respectively.

From (1.2) we immediately have

$$(3.14) \quad |u|_{0,D} \leq |g|_{0,D} + |f|_{0,D} E \int_0^\tau e^{-t} dt \leq |g|_{0,D} + |f|_{0,D}.$$

When $x_0 \in D_\delta^\lambda$, by Theorem 2.2, we have

$$u_{(\xi_0)}(x_0) = X_0 = EX_{\tau_1^\delta}.$$

So from (2.8) and (3.14),

$$\begin{aligned} |u_{(\xi_0)}(x_0)| &\leq E \left| u_{(\xi_{\tau_1^\delta})}(x_{\tau_1^\delta}) + (\xi_{\tau_1^\delta}^0 + \xi_{\tau_1^\delta}^{d+1}) u(x_{\tau_1^\delta}) \right| \\ &\quad + |f|_{1,D} E \int_0^{\tau_1^\delta} e^{-s} \left(|\xi_s| + 2r_s + |\xi_s^0| + |\xi_s^{d+1}| \right) ds \\ &\leq E \left| u_{(\xi_{\tau_1^\delta})}(x_{\tau_1^\delta}) \right| + \left(|g|_{0,D} + |f|_{0,D} \right) \left(E |\xi_{\tau_1^\delta}^0| + E |\xi_{\tau_1^\delta}^{d+1}| \right) \\ &\quad + |f|_{1,D} \left(E \int_0^{\tau_1^\delta} |\xi_s| + 2r_s ds + E \sup_{t \leq \tau_1^\delta} |\xi_t^0| + E \sup_{t \leq \tau_1^\delta} |\xi_t^{d+1}| \right). \end{aligned}$$

By Lemma 3.3, Davis inequality and Hölder inequality,

$$\begin{aligned} E |u_{(\xi_{\tau_1^\delta})}(x_{\tau_1^\delta})| &\leq \sup_{x \in \partial D_\delta^\lambda} \frac{|u_{(\xi)}(x)|}{\sqrt{B_1(x, \xi)}} \cdot E \sqrt{B_1(x_{\tau_1^\delta}, \xi_{\tau_1^\delta})} \\ &\leq \sup_{x \in \partial D_\delta^\lambda} \frac{|u_{(\xi)}(x)|}{\sqrt{B_1(x, \xi)}} \cdot \sqrt{B_1(x_0, \xi_0)}, \\ E |\xi_{\tau_1^\delta}^0| &\leq E \sup_{t \leq \tau_1^\delta} |\xi_t^0| \leq 3E \langle \xi^0 \rangle_{\tau_1^\delta}^{\frac{1}{2}} \leq 3 \left(E \langle \xi^0 \rangle_{\tau_1^\delta} \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} \\ &\leq N \left(E \int_0^{\tau_1^\delta} \frac{\psi_{(\xi_s)}^2}{\psi^2} ds \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} \leq N \sqrt{B_1(x_0, \xi_0)}, \\ E |\xi_{\tau_1^\delta}^{d+1}| &\leq E \sup_{t \leq \tau_1^\delta} |\xi_t^{d+1}| \leq NE \int_0^{\tau_1^\delta} |\xi_s| + \frac{|\psi_{(\xi_s)}|}{\psi} ds \\ &\leq NE \int_0^\infty I_{s \leq \tau_1^\delta} \cdot I_{s \leq \tau_1^\delta} \left(|\xi_s| + \frac{|\psi_{(\xi_s)}|}{\psi} \right) ds \\ &\leq N \left(E \tau_1^\delta \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} \left(E \int_0^{\tau_1^\delta} |\xi_s|^2 + \frac{\psi_{(\xi_s)}^2}{\psi^2} ds \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} \\ &\leq N \sqrt{B_1(x_0, \xi_0)}, \end{aligned}$$

$$E \int_0^{\tau_1^\delta} |\xi_s| + 2r_s ds \leq N E \int_0^{\tau_1^\delta} |\xi_s| + \frac{|\psi(\xi_s)|}{\psi} ds \leq N \sqrt{B_1(x_0, \xi_0)}.$$

Collecting all estimates above, we conclude that

$$|u_{(\xi_0)}(x_0)| \leq \sup_{x \in \partial D_\delta^\lambda} \frac{|u_\xi(x)|}{\sqrt{B_1(x, \xi)}} \cdot \sqrt{B_1(x_0, \xi_0)} + N(|g|_{0,D} + |f|_{1,D}) \sqrt{B_1(x_0, \xi_0)}.$$

So for any $x_0 \in D_\delta^\lambda$, $\xi_0 \in \mathbb{R}^d \setminus \{0\}$, we have

$$(3.15) \quad \frac{|u_{(\xi_0)}(x_0)|}{\sqrt{B_1(x_0, \xi_0)}} \leq \sup_{x \in \partial D_\delta^\lambda} \frac{|u_\xi(x)|}{\sqrt{B_1(x, \xi)}} + N_1,$$

with

$$(3.16) \quad N_1 = N(|g|_{1,D} + |f|_{1,D}).$$

Similarly, when $x_0 \in D_{\lambda^2}$, by Theorem 2.2, we have

$$u_{(\xi_0)}(x_0) = X_0 = EX_{\tau_2}.$$

Again, from (2.8) and (3.14),

$$\begin{aligned} |u_{(\xi_0)}(x_0)| &\leq E e^{-\phi_{\tau_2}} \left| u_{(\xi_{\tau_2})}(x_{\tau_2}) + (\xi_{\tau_2}^0 + \xi_{\tau_2}^{d+1}) u(x_{\tau_1^\delta}) \right| \\ &\quad + |f|_{1,D} E \int_0^{\tau_2} e^{-\phi_s} (|\xi_s| + 2r_s + |\xi_s^0| + |\xi_s^{d+1}|) ds \\ &\leq E e^{-\frac{1}{2}\phi_{\tau_2}} \left| u_{(\xi_{\tau_2})}(x_{\tau_2}) \right| + (|g|_{0,D} + |f|_{0,D}) \left(E e^{-\frac{1}{2}\phi_{\tau_2}} |\xi_{\tau_2}^0| + E e^{-\phi_{\tau_2}} |\xi_{\tau_2}^{d+1}| \right) \\ &\quad + |f|_{1,D} \left(E \int_0^{\tau_2} e^{-\phi_s} (|\xi_s| + 2r_s) ds + 4E \sup_{t \leq \tau_2} e^{-\frac{3}{4}\phi_t} |\xi_t^{d+1}| + 2E \sup_{s \leq \tau_2} e^{-\frac{1}{2}\phi_s} |\xi_s^0| \right). \end{aligned}$$

By Lemma 3.4, Davis inequality and Hölder inequality,

$$\begin{aligned} E e^{-\frac{1}{2}\phi_{\tau_2}} |u_{(\xi_{\tau_2})}(x_{\tau_2})| &\leq \sup_{x \in \partial D_{\lambda^2}} \frac{|u_\xi(x)|}{\sqrt{B_2(x, \xi)}} \cdot E \sqrt{e^{-\phi_{\tau_2}} B_2(x_{\tau_2}, \xi_{\tau_2})} \\ &\leq \sup_{x \in \partial D_{\lambda^2}} \frac{|u_\xi(x)|}{\sqrt{B_2(x, \xi)}} \cdot \sqrt{B_2(x_0, \xi_0)}, \\ E e^{-\frac{1}{2}\phi_{\tau_2}} |\xi_{\tau_2}^0| &\leq E \sup_{s \leq \tau_2} e^{-\frac{1}{2}\phi_s} |\xi_s^0| = E \sup_{s \leq \tau_2} \left| \int_0^s e^{-\frac{1}{2}\phi_s} \pi_r dw_r \right| \\ &\leq 3E \left(\int_0^{\tau_2} e^{-\phi_r} |\pi_r|^2 dr \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} \\ &\leq NE \left(\int_0^{\tau_2} e^{-\phi_r} |\xi_r|^2 dr \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} \\ &\leq N \sqrt{B_2(x_0, \xi_0)}, \\ E e^{-\phi_{\tau_2}} |\xi_{\tau_2}^{d+1}| &\leq E \sup_{t \leq \tau_2} e^{-\frac{3}{4}\phi_t} |\xi_t^{d+1}| \leq NE \int_0^{\tau_2} e^{-\frac{3}{4}\phi_s} |\xi_s| ds \end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
&\leq NE \left(\int_0^{\tau_2} e^{-\frac{1}{2}\phi_s} ds \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} \left(\int_0^{\tau_2} e^{-\phi_s} |\xi_s|^2 ds \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} \\
&\leq N \left(E \int_0^{\tau_2} e^{-\phi_s} |\xi_s|^2 ds \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} \\
&\leq N \sqrt{B_2(x_0, \xi_0)}, \\
E \int_0^{\tau_2} e^{-\phi_s} (|\xi_s| + 2r_s) ds &\leq NE \int_0^{\tau_2} e^{-\phi_s} |\xi_s| ds \leq N \sqrt{B_2(x_0, \xi_0)}.
\end{aligned}$$

Collecting all estimates above, we conclude that

$$|u_{(\xi_0)}(x_0)| \leq \sup_{x \in \partial D_{\lambda^2}} \frac{|u_{(\xi)}(x)|}{\sqrt{B_2(x, \xi)}} \cdot \sqrt{B_2(x_0, \xi_0)} + N(|g|_{0,D} + |f|_{1,D}) \sqrt{B_2(x_0, \xi_0)}.$$

So for any $x_0 \in D_{\lambda^2}$, $\xi_0 \in \mathbb{R}^d \setminus \{0\}$, we have

$$(3.17) \quad \frac{|u_{(\xi_0)}(x_0)|}{\sqrt{B_2(x_0, \xi_0)}} \leq \sup_{x \in \partial D_{\lambda^2}} \frac{|u_{(\xi)}(x)|}{\sqrt{B_2(x, \xi)}} + N_1,$$

with N_1 defined by (3.16).

Notice that

$$B_1(x, \xi) \begin{cases} \geq \sqrt{\psi}(1 + \sqrt{\psi})|\xi|^2 \geq \lambda^{\frac{1}{2}}|\xi|^2 & \text{on } \{\psi = \lambda\} \\ \leq \lambda(2 + \lambda)|\xi|^2 + K_1(2\lambda^2)^{\frac{3}{2}} \frac{\psi_{(\xi)}^2}{\lambda^2} \leq K\lambda|\xi|^2 & \text{on } \{\psi = \lambda^2\}. \end{cases}$$

Recall that K doesn't depend on λ . So for sufficiently small λ , we have $B_1(x, \xi) \geq 4B_2(x, \xi)$ when $\psi = \lambda$, $4B_1(x, \xi) \leq B_2(x, \xi)$ when $\psi = \lambda^2$.

Then on $\{x \in D : \psi(x) = \lambda\}$, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
\frac{|u_{(\xi)}(x)|}{\sqrt{B_1(x, \xi)}} &\leq \frac{1}{2} \frac{|u_{(\xi)}(x)|}{\sqrt{B_2(x, \xi)}} \\
&\leq \frac{1}{2} \left(\sup_{\{\psi=\lambda^2\}} \frac{|u_{(\xi)}(x)|}{\sqrt{B_2(x, \xi)}} + N_1 \right) \\
&\leq \frac{1}{4} \sup_{\{\psi=\lambda^2\}} \frac{|u_{(\xi)}(x)|}{\sqrt{B_1(x, \xi)}} + \frac{N_1}{2} \\
&\leq \frac{1}{4} \left(\sup_{\{\psi=\lambda\}} \frac{|u_{(\xi)}(x)|}{\sqrt{B_1(x, \xi)}} + \sup_{\{\psi=\delta\}} \frac{|u_{(\xi)}(x)|}{\sqrt{B_1(x, \xi)}} + N_1 \right) + \frac{N_1}{2} \\
&= \frac{1}{4} \sup_{\{\psi=\lambda\}} \frac{|u_{(\xi)}(x)|}{\sqrt{B_1(x, \xi)}} + \frac{1}{4} \sup_{\{\psi=\delta\}} \frac{|u_{(\xi)}(x)|}{\sqrt{B_1(x, \xi)}} + \frac{3N_1}{4},
\end{aligned}$$

which implies that

$$(3.18) \quad \sup_{\{\psi=\lambda\}} \frac{|u_{(\xi)}(x)|}{\sqrt{B_1(x, \xi)}} \leq \frac{1}{3} \sup_{\{\psi=\delta\}} \frac{|u_{(\xi)}(x)|}{\sqrt{B_1(x, \xi)}} + N_1.$$

Meanwhile, on $\{x \in D : \psi(x) = \lambda^2\}$, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
\frac{|u_{(\xi)}(x)|}{\sqrt{B_2(x, \xi)}} &\leq \frac{1}{2} \frac{|u_{(\xi)}(x)|}{\sqrt{B_1(x, \xi)}} \\
&\leq \frac{1}{2} \left(\sup_{\{\psi=\lambda\}} \frac{|u_{(\xi)}(x)|}{\sqrt{B_1(x, \xi)}} + \sup_{\{\psi=\delta\}} \frac{|u_{(\xi)}(x)|}{\sqrt{B_1(x, \xi)}} + N_1 \right) \\
&\leq \frac{1}{2} \left(\frac{1}{3} \sup_{\{\psi=\delta\}} \frac{|u_{(\xi)}(x)|}{\sqrt{B_1(x, \xi)}} + N_1 \right) + \frac{1}{2} \sup_{\{\psi=\delta\}} \frac{|u_{(\xi)}(x)|}{\sqrt{B_1(x, \xi)}} + \frac{N_1}{2} \\
&= \frac{2}{3} \sup_{\{\psi=\delta\}} \frac{|u_{(\xi)}(x)|}{\sqrt{B_1(x, \xi)}} + N_1.
\end{aligned}$$

Therefore,

$$(3.19) \quad \sup_{\{\psi=\lambda^2\}} \frac{|u_{(\xi)}(x)|}{\sqrt{B_2(x, \xi)}} \leq \frac{2}{3} \sup_{\{\psi=\delta\}} \frac{|u_{(\xi)}(x)|}{\sqrt{B_1(x, \xi)}} + N_1.$$

Combining (3.15) and (3.18), we get, for any $x \in D_\delta^\lambda$, $\xi \in \mathbb{R}^d \setminus \{0\}$,

$$(3.20) \quad \frac{|u_{(\xi)}(x)|}{\sqrt{B_1(x, \xi)}} \leq \frac{4}{3} \sup_{\{\psi=\delta\}} \frac{|u_{(\xi)}(x)|}{\sqrt{B_1(x, \xi)}} + 2N_1.$$

Combining (3.17) and (3.19), we get, for any $x \in D_{\lambda^2}$, $\xi \in \mathbb{R}^d \setminus \{0\}$,

$$(3.21) \quad \frac{|u_{(\xi)}(x)|}{\sqrt{B_2(x, \xi)}} \leq \frac{2}{3} \sup_{\{\psi=\delta\}} \frac{|u_{(\xi)}(x)|}{\sqrt{B_1(x, \xi)}} + 2N_1.$$

Thus it remains to estimate

$$\overline{\lim}_{\delta \downarrow 0} \left(\sup_{\{\psi=\delta\}} \frac{|u_{(\xi)}(x)|}{\sqrt{B_1(x, \xi)}} \right).$$

Notice that for each δ , there exist $x(\delta) \in \{\psi = \delta\}$ and $\xi(\delta) \in \{\xi : |\xi| = 1\}$, such that

$$\sup_{\{\psi=\delta\}} \frac{|u_{(\xi)}(x)|}{\sqrt{B_1(x, \xi)}} = \frac{|u_{(\xi(\delta))}(x(\delta))|}{\sqrt{B_1(x(\delta), \xi(\delta))}}.$$

A subsequence of $(x(\delta), \xi(\delta))$ converges to some (y, ζ) , such that $y \in \partial D$ and $|\zeta| = 1$.

If $\psi_{(\zeta)}(y) \neq 0$, then $B_1(x(\delta), \xi(\delta)) \rightarrow \infty$ as $\delta \downarrow 0$. In this case,

$$\overline{\lim}_{\delta \downarrow 0} \left(\sup_{\{\psi=\delta\}} \frac{|u_{(\xi)}(x)|}{\sqrt{B_1(x, \xi)}} \right) = \overline{\lim}_{\delta \downarrow 0} \frac{|u_{(\xi(\delta))}(x(\delta))|}{\sqrt{B_1(x(\delta), \xi(\delta))}} = 0.$$

If $\psi_{(\zeta)}(y) = 0$, then ζ is tangential to ∂D at y . In this case,

$$\begin{aligned}
(3.22) \quad \overline{\lim}_{\delta \downarrow 0} \left(\sup_{\{\psi=\delta\}} \frac{|u_{(\xi)}(x)|}{\sqrt{B_1(x, \xi)}} \right) &= \overline{\lim}_{\delta \downarrow 0} \frac{|u_{(\xi(\delta))}(x(\delta))|}{\sqrt{B_1(x(\delta), \xi(\delta))}} \\
&= \frac{|g_{(\zeta)}(y)|}{\sqrt{\lambda}} \leq N \sup_{\partial D} |g_x|.
\end{aligned}$$

From (3.20), (3.21) and (3.22), we have

$$\frac{|u_{(\xi)}(x)|}{\sqrt{B_1(x, \xi)}} \leq N(|f|_{1,D} + |g|_{1,D}), \text{ when } x \in D^\lambda;$$

$$\frac{|u_{(\xi)}(x)|}{\sqrt{B_2(x, \xi)}} \leq N(|f|_{1,D} + |g|_{1,D}), \text{ when } x \in D_{\lambda^2}.$$

Notice that $D^\lambda \cup D_{\lambda^2} = D$, and

$$\sqrt{B_1(x, \xi)} \leq N(|\xi| + \frac{|\psi(\xi)|}{\psi^{\frac{1}{2}}}), \text{ when } x \in D^\lambda;$$

$$\sqrt{B_2(x, \xi)} \leq N(|\xi| + \frac{|\psi(\xi)|}{\psi^{\frac{1}{2}}}), \text{ when } x \in D_{\lambda^2}.$$

We conclude that, for any $x \in D$ and $\xi \in \mathbb{R}^d$,

$$|u_{(\xi)}(x)| \leq N(|\xi| + \frac{|\psi(\xi)|}{\psi^{\frac{1}{2}}})(|f|_{1,D} + |g|_{1,D}).$$

The inequality (3.3) is proved. $\square$

The proof of (3.4) is similar.

Proof of (3.4). When $x_0 \in D_\delta^\lambda$, by Theorem 2.2, we have

$$u_{(\xi_0)(\xi_0)}(x_0) = u_{(\xi_0)(\xi_0)}(x_0) + u_{(\eta_0)}(x_0) = Y_0 = EY_{\tau_1^\delta}.$$

From (2.9) and (3.14),

$$\begin{aligned} |u_{(\xi_0)(\xi_0)}(x_0)| &\leq E|u_{(\xi_{\tau_1^\delta})(\xi_{\tau_1^\delta})}(x_{\tau_1^\delta})| + \sup_{x \in \partial D_\delta^\lambda, |\zeta|=1} |u_{(\zeta)}(x)| \cdot Ee^{-\tau_1^\delta} \left(|\eta_{\tau_1^\delta}| + 2|\tilde{\xi}_{\tau_1^\delta}^0| |\xi_{\tau_1^\delta}| \right) \\ &\quad + \left(|g|_{0,D} + |f|_{0,D} \right) Ee^{-\tau_1^\delta} |\tilde{\eta}_{\tau_1^\delta}^0| + |f|_{2,D} E \int_0^{\tau_1^\delta} e^{-s} \left[|\xi_s|^2 + |\eta_s| \right. \\ &\quad \left. + (4r_s + 2|\tilde{\xi}_s^0|)|\xi_s| + 2\hat{r}_s + 4|\tilde{\xi}_s^0|r_s + |\tilde{\eta}_s^0| \right] ds. \end{aligned}$$

Recall that in this case,

$$\tilde{\xi}_t^0 = \xi_t^0 + \xi_t^{d+1}, \quad \tilde{\eta}_t^0 = 2\xi_t^0 \xi_t^{d+1} + (\xi_t^{d+1})^2 + \eta_t^{d+1}.$$

It follows that

$$\begin{aligned}
|u_{(\xi_0)(\xi_0)}(x_0)| &\leq E|u_{(\xi_{\tau_1^\delta})(\xi_{\tau_1^\delta})}(x_{\tau_1^\delta})| + N \left(|g|_{0,D} + |f|_{0,D} + \sup_{x \in \partial D_\delta^\lambda, |\zeta|=1} |u_{(\zeta)}(x)| \right) \\
&\quad \cdot E e^{-\tau_1^\delta} \left(|\eta_{\tau_1^\delta}| + |\xi_{\tau_1^\delta}|^2 + |\xi_{\tau_1^\delta}^0|^2 + |\xi_{\tau_1^\delta}^{d+1}|^2 + |\eta_{\tau_1^\delta}^{d+1}| \right) \\
&\quad + N |f|_{2,D} E \int_0^{\tau_1^\delta} e^{-s} \left[|\xi_s|^2 + |\eta_s| + |\xi_s^0|^2 + |\xi_s^{d+1}|^2 + |\eta_s^{d+1}| + r_s^2 + \hat{r}_s \right] ds \\
&\leq E|u_{(\xi_{\tau_1^\delta})(\xi_{\tau_1^\delta})}(x_{\tau_1^\delta})| + N \left(|g|_{0,D} + |f|_{2,D} + \sup_{x \in \partial D_\delta^\lambda, |\zeta|=1} |u_{(\zeta)}(x)| \right) \\
&\quad \cdot \left(E \sup_{t \leq \tau_1^\delta} |\eta_t| + E \sup_{t \leq \tau_1^\delta} |\xi_t|^2 + E \sup_{t \leq \tau_1^\delta} |\xi_t^0|^2 + E \sup_{t \leq \tau_1^\delta} e^{-\frac{1}{2}t} |\xi_t^{d+1}|^2 \right. \\
&\quad \left. + E \sup_{t \leq \tau_1^\delta} e^{-\frac{1}{2}t} |\eta_t^{d+1}| + E \int_0^{\tau_1^\delta} r_s^2 + \hat{r}_s ds \right).
\end{aligned}$$

By Lemma 3.3, Davis inequality and Hölder inequality,

$$\begin{aligned}
E|u_{(\xi_{\tau_1^\delta})(\xi_{\tau_1^\delta})}(x_{\tau_1^\delta})| &\leq \sup_{x \in \partial D_\delta^\lambda} \frac{|u_{(\xi)}(\xi)(x)|}{B_1(x, \xi)} \cdot EB_1(x_{\tau_1^\delta}, \xi_{\tau_1^\delta}) \\
&\leq \sup_{x \in \partial D_\delta^\lambda} \frac{|u_{(\xi)}(\xi)(x)|}{B_1(x, \xi)} \cdot B_1(x_0, \xi_0), \\
E \sup_{t \leq \tau_1^\delta} |\eta_t| &\leq NB_1(x_0, \xi_0), \\
E \sup_{t \leq \tau_1^\delta} |\xi_t|^2 &\leq NB_1(x_0, \xi_0), \\
E \sup_{t \leq \tau_1^\delta} |\xi_t^0|^2 &\leq 4E \langle \xi^0 \rangle_{\tau_1^\delta} \leq NE \int_0^{\tau_1^\delta} \frac{\psi_{(\xi_t)}^2}{\psi^2} dt \leq NB_1(x_0, \xi_0), \\
E \sup_{t \leq \tau_1^\delta} e^{-\frac{1}{2}t} |\xi_t^{d+1}|^2 &\leq NE \sup_{t \leq \tau_1^\delta} e^{-\frac{1}{2}t} \left(\int_0^t |\xi_s| + \frac{|\psi_{(\xi_s)}|}{\psi} ds \right)^2 \\
&\leq NE \sup_{t \leq \tau_1^\delta} e^{-\frac{1}{2}t} \int_0^t |\xi_s|^2 + \frac{\psi_{(\xi_s)}^2}{\psi^2} ds \\
&\leq NE \int_0^{\tau_1^\delta} |\xi_t|^2 + \frac{\psi_{(\xi_t)}^2}{\psi^2} dt \\
&\leq NB_1(x_0, \xi_0), \\
E \sup_{t \leq \tau_1^\delta} e^{-\frac{1}{2}t} |\eta_t^{d+1}| &\leq NE \sup_{t \leq \tau_1^\delta} e^{-\frac{1}{2}t} \int_0^t |\xi_s|^2 + \frac{\psi_{(\xi_s)}^2}{\psi^2} + |\eta_s| ds \\
&\leq NE \sup_{t \leq \tau_1^\delta} e^{-\frac{1}{2}t} \left[\int_0^t |\xi_s|^2 + \frac{\psi_{(\xi_s)}^2}{\psi^2} ds + \sqrt{t} \left(\int_0^t |\eta_s|^2 ds \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} \right]
\end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
&\leq N \left[E \int_0^{\tau_1^\delta} |\xi_t|^2 + \frac{\psi_{(\xi_t)}^2}{\psi^2} dt + E \left(\int_0^{\tau_1^\delta} |\eta_t|^2 dt \right)^2 \right] \\
&\leq N B_1(x_0, \xi_0), \\
E \int_0^{\tau_1^\delta} r_s^2 + \hat{r}_s ds &\leq N E \int_0^{\tau_1^\delta} |\xi_t|^2 + \frac{\psi_{(\xi_t)}^2}{\psi^2} dt \leq N B_1(x_0, \xi_0).
\end{aligned}$$

Collecting all estimates above, we conclude that

$$\begin{aligned}
|u_{(\xi_0)(\xi_0)}(x_0)| &\leq \sup_{x \in \partial D_\delta^\lambda} \frac{|u_{(\xi)(\xi)}(x)|}{B_1(x, \xi)} \cdot B_1(x_0, \xi_0) \\
&\quad + N \left(|g|_{0,D} + |f|_{2,D} + \sup_{x \in \partial D_\delta^\lambda, |\zeta|=1} |u_{(\zeta)}(x)| \right) B_1(x_0, \xi_0).
\end{aligned}$$

So for any $x_0 \in D_\delta^\lambda$, $\xi_0 \in \mathbb{R}^d \setminus \{0\}$, we have

$$(3.23) \quad \frac{|u_{(\xi_0)(\xi_0)}(x_0)|}{B_1(x_0, \xi_0)} \leq \sup_{x \in \partial D_\delta^\lambda} \frac{|u_{(\xi)(\xi)}(x)|}{B_1(x, \xi)} + N_2,$$

with

$$(3.24) \quad N_2 = N \left(|g|_{2,D} + |f|_{2,D} + \sup_{x \in \partial D_\delta^\lambda, |\zeta|=1} |u_{(\zeta)}(x)| \right).$$

When $x_0 \in D_{\lambda^2}$, by Theorem 2.2, we have

$$u_{(\xi_0)(\xi_0)}(x_0) = u_{(\xi_0)(\xi_0)}(x_0) + u_{(\eta_0)}(x_0) = Y_0 = EY_{\tau_2}.$$

Again, from (2.9) and (3.14),

$$\begin{aligned}
|u_{(\xi_0)(\xi_0)}(x_0)| &\leq E e^{-\phi_{\tau_2}} |u_{(\xi_{\tau_2})(\xi_{\tau_2})}(x_{\tau_2})| + \sup_{x \in \partial D_{\lambda^2}, |\zeta|=1} |u_{(\zeta)}(x)| \cdot E e^{-\phi_{\tau_2}} \left(|\eta_{\tau_2}| + 2|\tilde{\xi}_{\tau_2}^0| |\xi_{\tau_2}| \right) \\
&\quad + \left(|g|_{0,D} + |f|_{0,D} \right) E e^{-\phi_{\tau_2}} |\tilde{\eta}_{\tau_2}^0| + |f|_{2,D} E \int_0^{\tau_2} e^{-\phi_s} \left[|\xi_s|^2 + |\eta_s| \right. \\
&\quad \left. + (4r_s + 2|\tilde{\xi}_s^0|) |\xi_s| + 2\hat{r}_s + 4|\tilde{\xi}_s^0| r_s + |\tilde{\eta}_s^0| \right] ds.
\end{aligned}$$

Recall that in this case,

$$\tilde{\xi}_t^0 = \xi_t^0 + \xi_t^{d+1}, \quad \tilde{\eta}_t^0 = \eta_t^0 + 2\xi_t^0 \xi_t^{d+1} + (\xi_t^{d+1})^2 + \eta_t^{d+1}.$$

Also, notice that by (3.3)

$$\sup_{x \in \partial D_{\lambda^2}, |\zeta|=1} |u_{(\zeta)}(x)| \leq N \left(1 + \frac{|\psi|_{1,D}}{\lambda^2} \right) \left(|f|_{1,D} + |g|_{1,D} \right) \leq N \left(|f|_{1,D} + |g|_{1,D} \right).$$

Therefore,

$$\begin{aligned}
|u_{(\xi_0)(\xi_0)}(x_0)| &\leq E e^{-\phi_{\tau_2}} |u_{(\xi_{\tau_2})(\xi_{\tau_2})}(x_{\tau_2})| + N \left(|g|_{1,D} + |f|_{1,D} \right) \\
&\quad \cdot E e^{-\phi_{\tau_2}} \left(|\eta_{\tau_2}| + |\xi_{\tau_2}|^2 + |\xi_{\tau_2}^0|^2 + |\xi_{\tau_2}^{d+1}|^2 + |\eta_{\tau_2}^{d+1}| + |\eta_{\tau_2}^0| \right) \\
&\quad + N |f|_{2,D} E \int_0^{\tau_2} e^{-\phi_s} \left[|\xi_s|^2 + |\eta_s| + |\xi_s^0|^2 + |\xi_s^{d+1}|^2 + |\eta_s^{d+1}| + |\eta_s^0| + r_s^2 + \hat{r}_s \right] ds
\end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
&\leq E e^{-\phi_{\tau_2}} |u_{(\xi_{\tau_2})(\xi_{\tau_2})}(x_{\tau_2})| + N \left(|g|_{1,D} + |f|_{2,D} \right) \\
&\quad \cdot \left(E \sup_{t \leq \tau_2} e^{-\phi_t + \frac{1}{2}t} |\eta_t| + E \sup_{t \leq \tau_2} e^{-\phi_t + \frac{1}{2}t} |\xi_t|^2 + E \sup_{t \leq \tau_2} e^{-\phi_t + \frac{1}{2}t} |\xi_t^0|^2 \right. \\
&\quad \left. + E \sup_{t \leq \tau_2} e^{-\phi_t + \frac{1}{4}t} |\xi_t^{d+1}|^2 + E \sup_{t \leq \tau_2} e^{-\phi_t + \frac{1}{4}t} |\eta_t^{d+1}| \right. \\
&\quad \left. + E \sup_{t \leq \tau_2} e^{-\phi_t + \frac{1}{2}t} |\eta_t^0| + E \int_0^{\tau_2} e^{-\phi_s} (r_s^2 + \hat{r}_s) ds \right).
\end{aligned}$$

By Lemma 3.4, Davis inequality and Hölder inequality,

$$\begin{aligned}
E e^{-\phi_{\tau_2}} |u_{(\xi_{\tau_2})(\xi_{\tau_2})}(x_{\tau_2})| &\leq \sup_{x \in \partial D_{\lambda^2}} \frac{|u_{(\xi)(\xi)}(x)|}{B_2(x, \xi)} \cdot E e^{-\phi_{\tau_2}} B_2(x_{\tau_2}, \xi_{\tau_2}) \\
&\leq \sup_{x \in \partial D_{\lambda^2}} \frac{|u_{(\xi)(\xi)}(x)|}{B_2(x, \xi)} \cdot B_2(x_0, \xi_0), \\
E \sup_{t \leq \tau_2} e^{-\phi_t + \frac{1}{2}t} |\eta_t| &\leq N B_2(x_0, \xi_0), \\
E \sup_{t \leq \tau_2} e^{-\phi_t + \frac{1}{2}t} |\xi_t|^2 &\leq N B_2(x_0, \xi_0), \\
E \sup_{t \leq \tau_2} e^{-\phi_t + \frac{1}{2}t} |\xi_t^0|^2 &= E \sup_{t \leq \tau_2} \left| \int_0^t e^{-\frac{1}{2}\phi_t + \frac{1}{4}t} \pi_s dw_s \right|^2 \\
&\leq 4E \int_0^{\tau_2} e^{-\phi_t + \frac{1}{2}t} |\pi_t|^2 dt \\
&\leq NE \int_0^{\tau_2} e^{-\phi_t + \frac{1}{2}t} |\xi_t|^2 dt \\
&\leq N B_2(x_0, \xi_0), \\
E \sup_{t \leq \tau_2} e^{-\phi_t + \frac{1}{4}t} |\xi_t^{d+1}|^2 &\leq NE \sup_{t \leq \tau_2} e^{-\phi_t + \frac{1}{4}t} \left(\int_0^t |\xi_s| ds \right)^2 \\
&\leq NE \sup_{t \leq \tau_2} e^{-\frac{1}{4}t} \left(\int_0^t e^{-\frac{1}{2}\phi_s + \frac{1}{4}s} |\xi_s| ds \right)^2 \\
&\leq NE \sup_{t \leq \tau_2} e^{-\frac{1}{4}t} \cdot t \int_0^t e^{-\phi_s + \frac{1}{2}s} |\xi_s|^2 ds \\
&\leq NE \int_0^{\tau_2} e^{-\phi_s + \frac{1}{2}s} |\xi_s|^2 ds \\
&\leq N B_2(x_0, \xi_0), \\
E \sup_{t \leq \tau_2} e^{-\phi_t + \frac{1}{4}t} |\eta_t^{d+1}| &\leq NE \sup_{t \leq \tau_2} e^{-\phi_t + \frac{1}{4}t} \int_0^t |\xi_s|^2 + |\eta_s| ds \\
&\leq NE \int_0^{\tau_2} e^{-\phi_s + \frac{1}{4}s} |\xi_s|^2 ds + NE \sup_{t \leq \tau_2} e^{-\frac{1}{4}t} \int_0^t e^{-\phi_s + \frac{1}{2}s} |\eta_s| ds
\end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
&\leq NB_2(x_0, \xi_0) + NE \sup_{t \leq \tau_2} e^{-\frac{1}{4}t} \cdot \sqrt{t} \left(\int_0^t e^{-2\phi_s+s} |\eta_s|^2 ds \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} \\
&\leq NB_2(x_0, \xi_0) + NE \left(\int_0^{\tau_2} e^{-2\phi_s+s} |\eta_s|^2 ds \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} \\
&\leq NB_2(x_0, \xi_0), \\
E \sup_{t \leq \tau_2} e^{-\phi_t + \frac{1}{2}t} |\eta_t^0| &\leq E \sup_{t \leq \tau_2} \left(\left| \int_0^t e^{-\frac{1}{2}\phi_t + \frac{1}{4}t} \pi_s dw_s \right|^2 + \int_0^t e^{-\phi_t + \frac{1}{2}t} |\pi_s|^2 ds \right. \\
&\quad \left. + \left| \int_0^t e^{-\phi_t + \frac{1}{2}t} \hat{\pi}_s dw_s \right| \right) \\
&\leq 5E \int_0^{\tau_2} e^{-\phi_s + \frac{1}{2}s} |\pi_s|^2 ds + 3E \left(\int_0^{\tau_2} e^{-2\phi_t+t} |\hat{\pi}_s|^2 \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} ds \\
&\leq NB_2(x_0, \xi_0), \\
E \int_0^{\tau_2} e^{-\phi_s} (r_s^2 + \hat{r}_s) ds &\leq NE \int_0^{\tau_2} e^{-\phi_s} (|\xi_s|^2 + |\eta_s|) ds \\
&\leq NB_2(x_0, \xi_0) + N \left(\int_0^{\tau_2} e^{-s} ds \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} \left(\int_0^{\tau_2} e^{-2\phi_s+s} |\eta_s|^2 ds \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} \\
&\leq NB_2(x_0, \xi_0).
\end{aligned}$$

Collecting all estimates above, we conclude that

$$|u_{(\xi_0)(\xi_0)}(x_0)| \leq \sup_{x \in \partial D_{\lambda^2}} \frac{|u_{(\xi)(\xi)}(x)|}{B_2(x, \xi)} \cdot B_2(x_0, \xi_0) + N(|g|_{1,D} + |f|_{2,D}) B_2(x_0, \xi_0).$$

So for any $x_0 \in D_{\lambda^2}$, $\xi_0 \in \mathbb{R}^d \setminus \{0\}$, we have

$$(3.25) \quad \frac{|u_{(\xi_0)(\xi_0)}(x_0)|}{B_2(x_0, \xi_0)} \leq \sup_{x \in \partial D_{\lambda^2}} \frac{|u_{(\xi)(\xi)}(x)|}{B_2(x, \xi)} + N_2,$$

with N_2 defined by (3.24).

Then on $\{x \in D : \psi(x) = \lambda\}$, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
\frac{|u_{(\xi)(\xi)}(x)|}{B_1(x, \xi)} &\leq \frac{1}{4} \frac{|u_{(\xi)(\xi)}(x)|}{B_2(x, \xi)} \\
&\leq \frac{1}{4} \left(\sup_{\{\psi=\lambda^2\}} \frac{|u_{(\xi)(\xi)}(x)|}{B_2(x, \xi)} + N_2 \right) \\
&\leq \frac{1}{16} \sup_{\{\psi=\lambda^2\}} \frac{|u_{(\xi)(\xi)}(x)|}{B_1(x, \xi)} + \frac{N_2}{4} \\
&\leq \frac{1}{16} \left(\sup_{\{\psi=\lambda\}} \frac{|u_{(\xi)(\xi)}(x)|}{B_1(x, \xi)} + \sup_{\{\psi=\delta\}} \frac{|u_{(\xi)(\xi)}(x)|}{B_1(x, \xi)} + N_2 \right) + \frac{N_2}{4} \\
&= \frac{1}{16} \sup_{\{\psi=\lambda\}} \frac{|u_{(\xi)(\xi)}(x)|}{B_1(x, \xi)} + \frac{1}{16} \sup_{\{\psi=\delta\}} \frac{|u_{(\xi)(\xi)}(x)|}{B_1(x, \xi)} + \frac{5N_2}{16},
\end{aligned}$$

which implies that

$$(3.26) \quad \sup_{\{\psi=\lambda\}} \frac{|u_{(\xi)(\xi)}(x)|}{B_1(x, \xi)} \leq \frac{1}{15} \sup_{\{\psi=\delta\}} \frac{|u_{(\xi)(\xi)}(x)|}{B_1(x, \xi)} + \frac{N_2}{3}.$$

Meanwhile, on $\{x \in D : \psi(x) = \lambda^2\}$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{|u_{(\xi)(\xi)}(x)|}{B_2(x, \xi)} &\leq \frac{1}{4} \frac{|u_{(\xi)(\xi)}(x)|}{B_1(x, \xi)} \\ &\leq \frac{1}{4} \left(\sup_{\{\psi=\lambda\}} \frac{|u_{(\xi)(\xi)}(x)|}{B_1(x, \xi)} + \sup_{\{\psi=\delta\}} \frac{|u_{(\xi)(\xi)}(x)|}{B_1(x, \xi)} + N_2 \right) \\ &\leq \frac{1}{4} \left(\frac{1}{15} \sup_{\{\psi=\delta\}} \frac{|u_{(\xi)(\xi)}(x)|}{B_1(x, \xi)} + \frac{N_2}{3} \right) + \frac{1}{4} \sup_{\{\psi=\delta\}} \frac{|u_{(\xi)(\xi)}(x)|}{B_1(x, \xi)} + \frac{N_2}{4} \\ &= \frac{4}{15} \sup_{\{\psi=\delta\}} \frac{|u_{(\xi)(\xi)}(x)|}{B_1(x, \xi)} + \frac{N_2}{3}. \end{aligned}$$

Therefore,

$$(3.27) \quad \sup_{\{\psi=\lambda^2\}} \frac{|u_{(\xi)(\xi)}(x)|}{B_2(x, \xi)} \leq \frac{4}{15} \sup_{\{\psi=\delta\}} \frac{|u_{(\xi)(\xi)}(x)|}{B_1(x, \xi)} + \frac{N_2}{3}.$$

Combining (3.23) and (3.26), we get, for any $x \in D_\delta^\lambda$, $\xi \in \mathbb{R}^d \setminus \{0\}$,

$$(3.28) \quad \frac{|u_{(\xi)(\xi)}(x)|}{B_1(x, \xi)} \leq \frac{16}{15} \sup_{\{\psi=\delta\}} \frac{|u_{(\xi)(\xi)}(x)|}{B_1(x, \xi)} + \frac{4N_2}{3}.$$

Combining (3.25) and (3.27), we get, for any $x \in D_{\lambda^2}$, $\xi \in \mathbb{R}^d \setminus \{0\}$,

$$(3.29) \quad \frac{|u_{(\xi)(\xi)}(x)|}{B_2(x, \xi)} \leq \frac{4}{15} \sup_{\{\psi=\delta\}} \frac{|u_{(\xi)(\xi)}(x)|}{B_1(x, \xi)} + \frac{4N_2}{3}.$$

Thus it remains to estimate

$$\overline{\lim}_{\delta \downarrow 0} \left(\sup_{\{\psi=\delta\}} \frac{|u_{(\xi)(\xi)}(x)|}{B_1(x, \xi)} \right) \text{ and } \overline{\lim}_{\delta \downarrow 0} \sup_{x \in \partial D_\delta^\lambda, |\zeta|=1} |u_{(\zeta)}(x)|.$$

First, notice that

$$\begin{aligned} \overline{\lim}_{\delta \downarrow 0} \sup_{x \in \partial D_\delta^\lambda, |\zeta|=1} |u_{(\zeta)}(x)| &\leq \sup_{x \in \partial D, |\zeta|=1} |u_{(\zeta)}(x)| + \sup_{x \in \{\psi=\lambda\}, |\zeta|=1} |u_{(\zeta)}(x)| \\ &\leq \sup_{x \in \partial D, |l|=1, l \parallel \partial D} |u_{(l)}(x)| + \sup_{x \in \partial D, |n|=1, n \perp \partial D} |u_{(n)}(x)| \\ &\quad + \sup_{x \in \{\psi=\lambda\}, |\zeta|=1} |u_{(\zeta)}(x)|, \end{aligned}$$

Apply Lemma 3.2 and first derivative estimate (3.3), we get

$$\overline{\lim}_{\delta \downarrow 0} \sup_{x \in \partial D_\delta^\lambda, |\zeta|=1} |u_{(\zeta)}(x)| \leq \sup_{x \in \partial D, |l|=1, l \parallel \partial D} |g_{(l)}(x)| + N(|g|_{2,D} + |f|_{0,D})$$

$$\begin{aligned}
& + N \left(1 + \frac{|\psi|_{1,D}}{\lambda} \right) (|g|_{1,D} + |f|_{1,D}) \\
& \leq N (|g|_{2,D} + |f|_{1,D}).
\end{aligned}$$

Second, notice that for each δ , there exist $x(\delta) \in \{\psi = \delta\}$ and $\xi(\delta) \in \{\xi : |\xi| = 1\}$, such that

$$\sup_{\{\psi=\delta\}} \frac{|u_{(\xi)(\xi)}(x)|}{B_1(x, \xi)} = \frac{|u_{(\xi(\delta))(\xi(\delta))}(x(\delta))|}{B_1(x(\delta), \xi(\delta))}.$$

A subsequence of $(x(\delta), \xi(\delta))$ converges to some (y, ζ) , such that $y \in \partial D$ and $|\zeta| = 1$.

If $\psi_{(\zeta)}(y) \neq 0$, then $B_1(x(\delta), \xi(\delta)) \rightarrow \infty$ as $\delta \downarrow 0$. In this case,

$$\overline{\lim}_{\delta \downarrow 0} \left(\sup_{\{\psi=\delta\}} \frac{|u_{(\xi)(\xi)}(x)|}{B_1(x, \xi)} \right) = \overline{\lim}_{\delta \downarrow 0} \frac{|u_{(\xi(\delta))(\xi(\delta))}(x(\delta))|}{B_1(x(\delta), \xi(\delta))} = 0.$$

If $\psi_{(\zeta)}(y) = 0$, then ζ is tangential to ∂D at y . In this case,

$$\overline{\lim}_{\delta \downarrow 0} \left(\sup_{\{\psi=\delta\}} \frac{|u_{(\xi)(\xi)}(x)|}{B_1(x, \xi)} \right) = \overline{\lim}_{\delta \downarrow 0} \frac{|u_{(\xi(\delta))(\xi(\delta))}(x(\delta))|}{B_1(x(\delta), \xi(\delta))} = \frac{|g_{(\zeta)(\zeta)}(y)| + K|u_{(n)}(y)|}{\lambda}.$$

By Lemma (3.2), we have

$$\frac{|g_{(\zeta)(\zeta)}(y)| + K|u_{(n)}(y)|}{\lambda} \leq N(|g|_{2,D} + |f|_{0,D}).$$

Therefore, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
\frac{|u_{(\xi)(\xi)}(x)|}{B_1(x, \xi)} & \leq N(|f|_{2,D} + |g|_{2,D}), \text{ when } x \in D^\lambda; \\
\frac{|u_{(\xi)(\xi)}(x)|}{B_2(x, \xi)} & \leq N(|f|_{2,D} + |g|_{2,D}), \text{ when } x \in D_{\lambda^2}.
\end{aligned}$$

It follows that, for any $x \in D$ and $\xi \in \mathbb{R}^d$,

$$|u_{(\xi)(\xi)}(x)| \leq N(|\xi|^2 + \frac{\psi_{(\xi)}^2}{\psi})(|f|_{2,D} + |g|_{2,D}).$$

The inequality (3.4) is proved. $\square$

Proof of the existence and uniqueness of (3.5). The fact that u given by (1.2) satisfies (3.5) follows from Theorem 1.3 in [5].

To proof the uniqueness, assume that $u_1, u_2 \in C_{loc}^{1,1}(D) \cap C^{0,1}(\bar{D})$ are solutions of (3.5). Let $\Lambda = |u_1|_{0,D} \vee |u_2|_{0,D}$. For constants δ and ε satisfying $0 < \delta < \varepsilon < 1$, define

$$\Psi(x, t) = \varepsilon(1 + \psi(x))\Lambda e^{-\delta t}, \quad U(x, t) = u(x)e^{-\varepsilon t} \text{ in } \bar{D} \times (0, \infty),$$

$$F[U] = U_t + LU - cU + f \text{ in } D \times (0, \infty).$$

Notice that a.e. in D , we have

$$F[U_1 - \Psi] = -\varepsilon e^{-\varepsilon t} u_1 + \delta \Psi - \varepsilon \Lambda e^{-\delta t} L\psi + c\Psi \geq \varepsilon \Lambda (e^{-\delta t} - e^{-\varepsilon t}) \geq 0,$$

$$F[U_2 + \Psi] = \varepsilon e^{-\varepsilon t} u_2 - \delta \Psi + \varepsilon \Lambda e^{-\delta t} L\psi - c\Psi \leq \varepsilon \Lambda (e^{-\varepsilon t} - e^{-\delta t}) \leq 0.$$

On $\partial D \times (0, \infty)$, we have

$$U_1 - U_2 - 2\Psi = -2\Psi \leq 0.$$

On $\bar{D} \times T$, where $T = T(\varepsilon, \delta)$ is a sufficiently large constant, we have

$$U_1 - U_2 - 2\Psi = (u_1 - u_2)e^{-\varepsilon T} - 2\varepsilon(1 + \psi)\Lambda e^{-\delta T} \leq 2\Lambda(e^{-\varepsilon T} - \varepsilon e^{-\delta T}) \leq 0.$$

Applying Theorem 1.1 in [4], we get

$$U_1 - U_2 - 2\Psi \leq 0 \text{ a.e. in } \bar{D} \times (0, T).$$

It follows that

$$u_1 - u_2 \leq 2\varepsilon(1 + \psi)\Lambda e \rightarrow 0, \text{ as } \varepsilon \rightarrow 0, \text{ a.e. in } D.$$

Similarly, $u_2 - u_1 \leq 0$ a.e. in D . The uniqueness is proved. $\square$

Remark 3.4. Based on our proof, if we replace $\sigma(x), b(x), c(x), f(x)$ and $g(x)$ in (1.3) and (1.2) by $\sigma(\omega, t, x), b(\omega, t, x), c(\omega, t, x), f(\omega, t, x)$ and $g(\omega, t, x)$, defined on $\Omega \times [0, \infty) \times D$, under appropriate measurable assumptions, the first and second derivative estimates (3.3) and (3.4) are still true.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENT

The author is sincerely grateful to his advisor, N.V. Krylov, for introducing this method to the author and giving many useful suggestions and comments on the improvements.

REFERENCES

1. M. I. Freĭdlin, *Functional integration and partial differential equations*, Annals of Mathematics Studies, vol. 109, Princeton University Press, Princeton, NJ, 1985. MR 833742 (87g:60066)
2. L. Hörmander, *Hypoelliptic second order differential equations*, Acta Math. **119** (1967), 147–171. MR 0222474 (36 #5526)
3. J. J. Kohn and L. Nirenberg, *Degenerate elliptic-parabolic equations of second order*, Comm. Pure Appl. Math. **20** (1967), 797–872. MR 0234118 (38 #2437)
4. N. V. Krylov, *Some new results in the theory of controlled diffusion processes*, Mat. Sb. (N.S.) **109(151)** (1979), no. 1, 146–164, 166. MR 538554 (80j:60104)
5. ———, *On the traditional proof of the Bellman equation for controllable diffusion processes*, Litovsk. Mat. Sb. **21** (1981), no. 1, 59–68. MR 617995 (82h:93087)
6. ———, *Moment estimates for the quasiderivatives, with respect to the initial data, of solutions of stochastic equations and their application*, Mat. Sb. (N.S.) **136(178)** (1988), no. 4, 510–529, 591. MR 965890 (89k:60078)
7. ———, *Smoothness of the payoff function for a controllable diffusion process in a domain*, Izv. Akad. Nauk SSSR Ser. Mat. **53** (1989), no. 1, 66–96. MR 992979 (90f:93040)
8. ———, *On the first quasiderivatives of solutions of Itô stochastic equations*, Izv. Ross. Akad. Nauk Ser. Mat. **56** (1992), no. 2, 398–426. MR 1180379 (93m:60119)
9. ———, *Quasiderivatives for solutions of Itô's stochastic equations and their applications*, Stochastic analysis and related topics (Oslo, 1992), Stochastics Monogr., vol. 8, Gordon and Breach, Montreux, 1993, pp. 1–44. MR 1268004 (95e:60057)

10. ———, *Introduction to the theory of diffusion processes*, Translations of Mathematical Monographs, vol. 142, American Mathematical Society, Providence, RI, 1995, Translated from the Russian manuscript by Valim Khidekel and Gennady Pasechnik. MR 1311478 (96k:60196)
11. ———, *Probabilistic methods of investigating interior smoothness of harmonic functions associated with degenerate elliptic operators*, Pubblicazioni del Centro di Ricerca Matematica Ennio de Giorgi. [Publications of the Ennio de Giorgi Mathematical Research Center], Scuola Normale Superiore, Pisa, 2004. MR 2144644 (2006h:60004)
12. ———, *Quasiderivatives and interior smoothness of harmonic functions associated with degenerate diffusion processes*, Electron. J. Probab. **9** (2004), no. 21, 615–633 (electronic). MR 2082053 (2005j:60148)
13. O. A. Oleĭnik and E. V. Radkevič, *Second order equations with nonnegative characteristic form*, Plenum Press, New York, 1973, Translated from the Russian by Paul C. Fife. MR 0457908 (56 #16112)
14. D. Stroock and S. R. S. Varadhan, *On degenerate elliptic-parabolic operators of second order and their associated diffusions*, Comm. Pure Appl. Math. **25** (1972), 651–713. MR 0387812 (52 #8651)

127 VINCENT HALL, 206 CHURCH ST. SE, MINNEAPOLIS, MN 55455